

Antonelli, Michael R.
 Bachiller, Rayfel M.
 Ballard, John M.
 Banta, Peter A.
 Behel, Ivan M.
 Bennett, Thomas D.
 Bennight, Kenneth L.
 Bergstrom, Dan T.
 Blesemeier, Harold W., Jr.
 Brock, Jude T.
 Brons, Dennis R.
 Brown, Shepard R.
 Burak, Thaddeus H., Jr.
 Burch, Joseph E.
 Burfield, Timothy L.
 Burton, Richard E.
 Canada, Tommy D.
 Carman, Edward L.
 Carroll, William H., Jr.
 Cassidy, Barry L.
 Colton, Russel C.

Colyar, Henry J.
 Cryder, Michael J.
 Danin, Mark L.
 Daugherty, James R.
 Day, Joseph J.
 Depass, Robert J.
 Elchorn, Robert E.
 Fassino, Michael C.
 Fischer, Vincent L., Jr.
 Fish, Ronald C.
 Fogle, Homer W., Jr.
 Forrester, Robert A.
 Foster, Percy E.
 French, Richard B.
 Frisbie, James R.
 Galloway, Francis O., Jr.
 Garcia, Lawrence E.
 Gerberding, Philip C.
 Gordon, Gregory K.
 Graham, Richard S.
 Hardee, James C.
 Hare, Robert R., III

Hart, Robert L.
 Havrilla, Michael J.
 Henderson, David H., Jr.
 Hoemann, Kingsley E.
 Huley, Jan C.
 Johansson, Eddie E., III
 Kane, Terry R.
 Kephart, Michael M.
 Kruse, Raymond M.
 Leonardo, James F.
 Livingston, Robert J.
 Lyndes, Lee T.
 Mahon, John F.
 Mann, Edwin C.
 Marshall, Gary W.
 Maxie, Michael J.
 May, Roy G.
 McDonough, Ian D.
 McLaughlin, James M.
 Meade, Gene S.
 Metcalf, Richard D.

Moon, Frederick J.
 Mullane, John C., Jr.
 Myers, William N.
 Nadeau, Lawrence L., Jr.
 Nance, Michael R.
 Noll, Raymond K.
 Polak, Raymond L.
 Reardon, Edward J., Jr.
 Roberts, Gregg
 Robichaud, Robert S.
 Rys, Robert A.
 Sall, James E., Jr.
 Scarlett, Ervin W., Jr.
 Schlegel, Stanley C.
 Seemeyer, William J.
 Sherbin, John E.
 Shintani, Richard Y.
 Short, James J.
 Solymossy, Leslie
 Spaulding, Douglas K.
 Sreboth, Michael J.

Stevens, Ronald L.
 Stewart, Henri P.
 Teague, William B., III
 Tolle, Theodore K.
 Tripp, Dennis E.
 Turner, Craig J.
 Tyler, Douglas D.

Varley, Robert J.
 Vocke, Timothy L.
 Walker, Richard W.
 Williams, Hensley C.
 Williamson, David L.
 Wilson, Thomas E.
 Wood, Joel O.
 Zakielarz, George E.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Michael Collins, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony D. Marshall, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Malagasy Republic.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, December 12, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants and Thy glory unto their children.—Psalm 90: 16.

Our Father in heaven and on earth, author of our being, sustainer of our lives, and the giver of every good gift, we lift our hearts unto Thee praying that Thy spirit may so possess us that it will crowd out all evil intentions and enable us to think great thoughts, to do generous deeds, and to live genuinely good lives. Thus may we hallow Thy presence this day and all through the Advent season.

We commend to Thy loving care the men and women in our Armed Forces. Keep them strong when tempted, steadfast when lonely, and steady in the performance of duty when in peril that they may serve Thee without stumbling and without stain. Bless their homes through these days of separation and keep them loyal to each other, to our country, and to Thee.

Crown with success, we pray Thee, the efforts of our conferences to end war and to mark the beginning of peace on this planet. To this end may we follow the leading of Thy spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4244. An act to raise the ceiling on appropriations of the Administrative Conference of the United States;

H. Con. Res. 345. Concurrent resolution providing for printing as a House document "A Guide to Student Assistance"; and

H. Con. Res. 407. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9233. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to promote the efficient and effective use of the revolving fund of the Civil Service Commission in connection with certain functions of the Commission, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14916. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14916) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2102. An act for the relief of Percy Ispas Avram;

S. 1389. An act for the relief of Alex G. W. Miller;

S. 2523. An act to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to extend and improve the program of assistance under that act for community mental health centers and facilities for the treatment of alcoholics and narcotic addicts, to establish programs for mental health of children, and for other purposes;

S. 2809. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health, project grants for graduate training in public health and traineeships for professional public health personnel;

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 44th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document; and

S. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the 1969 report of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education (Senate Report 91-501).

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14916, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14916) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NATCHER, GIALMO, PATTEN, PRYOR of Arkansas, MAHON, DAVIS of Wisconsin, RIEGLE, WYATT, and Bow.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM THE SECOND WEEK OF MARCH 1970 AS VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 10) authorizing the President to proclaim the second week of March 1970 as Volunteers of America Week, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "annually."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM JANUARY 1970 AS "NATIONAL BLOOD DONOR MONTH"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 154) to authorize and request the President to proclaim the month of January of each year as "National Blood Donor Month."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES 154

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the vital role of the voluntary blood donor in medical care, the President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of January of each year as "National Blood Donor Month."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 1, line 5, strike the word "annually", and on page 1, line 6, strike the words "of each year", and insert in lieu thereof "1970."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize and request the President to proclaim the month of January 1970 as 'National Blood Donor Month.'"

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE INDIVIDUAL TAX EXEMPTION TO \$800

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written about the debate over the tax reform measure. Let me first of all state that it is my opinion that we have few domestic issues facing the Congress which are more important to the American people.

We simply cannot justify some of the inequities in our present tax structure.

One area about which I feel very strongly is for raising the figure for individual exemptions on our income tax from \$600 to \$800. This would give immediate and meaningful relief to every household and would be a particularly fair tax break for the American people.

I recognize that there are many controversial provisions of the tax reform measure, but I would hope that we will find a large majority in favor of this particular proposal.

It is simple and easily understood by the American people. It would give them a tax break they can certainly use.

The present \$600 figure is unrealistic to our times and an \$800 exemption would give an immediate and easily understood break to the overburdened taxpayer.

CORONER'S INVESTIGATION OF THE DEATHS OF TWO LEADERS OF THE BLACK PANTHERS IN CHICAGO OFFERS US BEST HOPE FOR AN OPEN PROCEEDING TO GET ALL THE FACTS

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the bizarre shootout in Chicago last week in which two members and leaders of the Black Panthers were killed, there has been a great deal of discussion on this entire event all over the country and here in the Congress.

The senior Senator from Illinois has called for a Federal investigation.

The State's attorney has called for an investigation.

One of our own colleagues has called for the Commission on Violence to investigate this matter.

None of our Members have announced they plan to conduct their own investigation in Chicago.

I should like to assure the House that under Illinois law, the county coroner has the legal responsibility, through a coroner's jury, to ascertain the cause of death whenever a death of violence occurs.

Cook County coroner, Dr. Andrew Toman, a very distinguished physician, announced in Chicago this morning that he is impaneling a special blue-ribbon coroner's jury. I have suggested he invite the universities of our area to submit to him the name of their top criminologist to be placed in the coroner's jury which will investigate this matter. I believe these distinguished criminologists, operating in the open for all to see and judge, can place all the evidence before the public.

I am confident that when this jury has gone through its deliberations—and I should like to point out that the jury has the right to make a sweeping investigation, including placing witnesses under oath to testify as to the circumstances that led to the deaths of these two Black Panthers—this coroner's jury will give us all the facts. I would recommend that all other investigations, which provide nothing more than a side show and only add to the tensions, be suspended until this coroner's jury has an opportunity to operate in an orderly manner consistent with the laws of Illinois and the constitution of Illinois. If the coroner's jury fails to provide a complete record for all to make an impartial judgment, these other investigations can proceed to fill the gap.

Those who call for law and order ought to follow the legal procedures in conducting this kind of investigation, and I submit that the coroner of Cook County is indeed proposing this sort of an orderly legal procedure. I believe the coroner's inquest held out in the open for all to witness can help avoid the reckless speculation and irresponsible gossip and rumor which usually surrounds closed or secret investigations. Dr. Toman has assured me all parties involved in this matter will be subpoenaed and asked to testify under oath and all pathology reports will be made available to the jury. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I am confident the Chicago police will be completely vindicated by any investigations. They have all offered to take lie tests to prove their conduct was in keeping with police procedures under the circumstances.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND ANOTHER \$200 EXEMPTION

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, 25 million people in the United States today are drawing social security. These are largely our elderly senior citizens. Many drawing social security are the disabled, and widows with minor children. Those drawing social security are the ones hit hardest by rising prices, exorbitant interest rates, high rent, and the ever-spiraling cost of living. These are the real victims of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge and plead with the House to insist upon the 15-percent increase in social security effective immediately—not later than January 1, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to plead for another group of people who have been forgotten in the past when tax benefits were passed around. They have no lush annuities, depletion allowances or tax breaks. They are not in the expense account group of favored taxpayers. I plead for those in the lower- and middle-income brackets with only the \$600 exemption. This group of taxpayers should be given immediate relief in the form of at least another \$200 personal exemption. This group of our fellow citizens have taxes taken from their paychecks virtually every week without ever seeing this part of their earnings. There is no way for them to employ the counsel to seek out the loopholes in expertly written tax legislation. We must give them relief to help meet the family budget, send the children to school and help provide proper medical care for the family.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of the House Democratic steering committee. I voted for the following resolution when it was adopted last evening:

Resolved, That the House Democratic Steering Committee hereby endorses and recommends enactment of proposed legislation providing for a \$200 increase in the personal income tax exemption, to the House Tax Reform Bill and a 15-percent increase in Social Security Insurance System benefits effective as of January 1, 1970.

I was proud to join in presenting the resolution to my warm friend and colleague, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

If the social security increase and the \$200 additional tax exemption are included in the final version of the tax bill, I do not believe it will be vetoed. If so, I believe the veto will be overridden by the two-thirds vote of both branches of the Congress.

WHO PAYS WHAT FOR WHOM?

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, last week I was defending the President's foreign policy, and I would just like to pass a little advice on to my friend from Ohio and other Republicans. Do not ask too many questions about who is picking up the check for what, because we might start asking the question about who picked up the check at San Clemente for the improvements there and who picked up the check for the refurbishing of the interior of Air Force One for \$1 million. I have a lot more, but I shall not mention any more. I thought I would tip you off to a couple.

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCLOSURE OF CONSTRUCTION DETAILS ON PASSENGER VESSELS MEETING SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 210) to eliminate requirements for disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels meeting prescribed safety standards, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 4400 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 362), is amended—

"(1) by inserting in the second sentence of subsection (b) between the words 'information' and 'as' the following: ', and shall specify the registry of any vessel named,' and

"(2) by inserting between the second and third sentences of subsection (b) thereof the following new sentence: "The passenger notification and promotional or advertising literature inclusions required by this subsection, except the inclusion of the country of registry of the vessel, do not apply to voyages by vessels meeting the safety standards prescribed in subsection (c) of this section."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give us a few words of explanation on this conference report? I believe it is a conference report, or is it concurrence in a Senate amendment?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes. It is a Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. It is a Senate amendment to a House bill. The Senate amendment is fully germane to the bill?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. It involves no nongermane material at all.

Mr. GARMATZ. No.

Mr. GROSS. This is a bill the House previously approved?

Mr. GARMATZ. Unanimously, yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1969, the House passed H.R. 210 which would eliminate, where the vessels meet prescribed safety standards, the requirement that all passenger ship promotional literature and advertising should disclose compliance with safety standards. The bill provided, however, that the vessel registry should be specified in the promotional literature or advertising.

When H.R. 210 came before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Senate Commerce Committee for hearings, the Coast Guard pointed out that the bill as passed the House did not specify which agency would administer the requirement of disclosure of registry and did not provide any penalty for failure to specify the ship's registry. In order to answer this comment, the Senate committee amended the bill by inserting language in subsection (b) of the existing law—46 U.S.C. 362—similar to language in the House bill, which authorizes the Coast Guard to promulgate regulations with respect to disclosure of registry. In addition, the penalties existing in subsection (b) would now apply to the specification of registry requirement. I concur in the Senate amendment which is substantially the same as the House passed bill and asked that the House approve this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 319]

Abbitt	Clark	Findley
Addabbo	Clausen,	Fulton, Tenn.
Albert	Don H.	Gallagher
Anderson,	Conte	Goldwater
Tenn.	Conyers	Gray
Ashley	Dawson	Hagan
Bell, Calif.	Diggs	Hall
Cabell	Dowdy	Hébert
Cahill	Edmondson	Hollifield
Cederberg	Fascell	Hosmer

Kirwan	Morse	Schneebeli
Kluczynski	Murphy, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Leggett	Pike	Udall
Lipscomb	Pollock	Utt
McEwen	Powell	Whalley
Meskill	Reifel	Winn
Mikva	Rlegle	Wylder

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that I was unavoidably absent during House consideration last night of H.R. 15209, a bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1970. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted against the motion by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) to recommit the bill with instructions to delete \$7.5 million for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. I am pleased that motion was defeated by a substantial margin, and that the bill was approved.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2864, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2864) to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman be good enough to give us a brief explanation of what transpired in conference?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I expect to do that when I am recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 10, 1969.)

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 2864, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969 which is now before the House includes authorizations essential to carrying out our programs in this field and makes a number of improvements in existing law. I do not believe that this is a controversial bill and the House version passed by a vote of 339 to 9. Naturally, on an omnibus bill like this, there were many issues in conference and I am pleased to report that the House position prevailed in two out of every three items and on those points where we could not reach agreement, the compromise generally fell halfway between the House and Senate positions.

Most importantly the House prevailed on the basic issues of whether this should be a 1-year or a 2-year bill. The conference report which was agreed to by all of the conferees on both sides maintains the House position for a 1-year bill. The Senate which had authorizations totaling a little over \$4 billion for the 2-year bill fought hard for its position but in the end agreed to limit this measure to 1 year. The only exception was additional authorizations for fiscal year 1972 for the very popular programs of interest subsidies for homeownership and for rental housing. In this case, the House conferees finally accepted the Senate provision authorizing \$170 million in new contract authority for each of the two interest subsidy programs. Also the programs administered by Farmers Home Administration were extended for 4 years though the conferees accepted the House dollar figures for the revolving loan and insurance fund.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to describe some of the major changes made in conference. The first item involved the per unit ceilings on FHA mortgage insurance. The House bill had raised these ceilings by 10 percent, whereas the Senate bill would have provided much larger increases and a built-in escalator based on index. The conference report retained the 10-percent increases for FHA programs for sales and rental housing for those programs which already have relatively high ceilings. It provides for an increase of 15 percent in the ceilings of multifamily programs aimed at low- and moderate-income families and 20 percent for homeownership programs which in existing law have relatively low ceilings. There are many section numbers involved but among the major programs the section 203(b) sales housing program is included in the 10-percent increase, the section 236 interest subsidy program for rental housing would have a 15-percent increase and the section 235 interest subsidy program for homeownership would be raised by 20 percent. There was a similar difference in the provision affecting public housing ceilings. Again, the House bill would have provided an increase of 10 percent while the Senate bill would have provided for substantially larger increases and an automatic escalator. The conferees agreed to drop the escalator clause and set figures within the range of the two differing versions.

The House version included a provision not in the Senate bill requiring a one-for-one replacement of any housing demolished by urban renewal. The conferees agreed on an administration pro-

posal which keeps the essence of this provision but does not require that the replacement be limited to urban renewal project areas.

The House also prevailed on its provision authorizing the use of 10 percent of the funds appropriated for the model cities program in smaller communities without the further limitation that such grants cannot exceed four-fifths of the local share of the cost of other Federal programs being used in the model cities area. This had been done in the recognition of the fact that in many smaller communities, a wide range of other Federal programs could not be usefully employed. I believe that this proposal is a very valuable one and I was very glad that we were able to keep it in conference. The only change was to define smaller communities as cities or counties of less than 100,000 population.

The House conferees accepted a provision from the Senate bill with an amendment authorizing additional public housing annual contribution contract authority for the purpose of reducing the rents of very low income families and for the further purpose of meeting operating deficits of local authorities and to enable them to improve the management of projects.

The House also prevailed on its position making \$150 million available immediately for the very important program of 3 percent direct loans for housing for the elderly. This has been one of our most successful programs in an area of urgent need and I hope that the Administration will have no reluctance in making use of this authority.

The committee has heard many complaints from sponsors of the housing for the elderly projects to convert to the section 236 interest subsidy program which still does not have adequate funding to meet the whole range of needs for low- and moderate-income families.

The House conferees also receded on its provision removing the 5,500 population limit on programs under the Farmers Home Administration. However, the conferees recognized that existing law creates problems in some areas and the statement of the managers directs HUD and the Department of Agriculture to study this question to which the committee will give further consideration next year.

Altogether the dollar authorizations in the bill total \$4.8 billion which is slightly below the figure originally approved by the House.

The principal changes were modest reductions in the authorizations for urban renewal and for model cities. The House bill would have authorized the appropriation of \$2 billion for urban renewal in the next fiscal year while the Senate bill had \$1.3 billion for the first year and \$1.7 billion for the second year. The conferees agreed on \$1.7 billion for 1 year. In view of the carryover of existing authority of somewhat over \$500 million, this should be adequate for the urban renewal program in fiscal year 1971. In the case of model cities, the House bill provided for the appropriation of \$750 million for next year while the Senate bill had only \$287 million for next year plus \$1.5 million for the fol-

lowing year. The conference report authorizes \$600 million which together with the carryover authority of \$800 million should be adequate for this program for next year. The conference report also retains in full the \$1.5 billion authorization for GNMA special assistance purchases of FHA and VA mortgages on low cost homes. It is most important that the administration make use of this authority as quickly as possible to help relieve the critical tightness in the mortgage market and to halt the decline in housing starts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this covers the highlights of the action taken by the conference committee on the balance, the report before us today is essential in the House bill. It is a very sound 1-year bill which will keep our housing and urban development programs going at a high rate and the committee expects to have major legislation in the next session of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a housing bill in which we can all take pride and satisfaction. It is not a large bill on the scale of the acts of 1965, 1966, and 1968, but it is a very important bill which will carry our housing and urban development programs through the next fiscal year at the highest levels of authorization in our history. It also perfects existing programs with special attention to assist low- and moderate-income families.

It is highly regrettable that we have suffered a severe deficit over the past years in producing the homes necessary to meet the 10-year housing goal set forth in last year's act. The most important factor in this setback has been the administration's tight money policy which has hit so hard at the home-building industry and the home-buying public. The conference report before us includes the amendment authored by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS), which authorizes an additional \$1.5 billion for GNMA special assistance purchases mortgages on low-cost housing at par. This, together with the use of the GNMA tandem plan included in the conference report, can stimulate housing production promptly while the Congress works on other measures to relieve the tight money problem.

Mr. Speaker, the \$1.7 billion, which the conference report authorizes for urban renewal grants, together with more than \$500 million carryover of existing authority, would permit the highest level of activity ever achieved under this program.

The conference report also reserves funds for the neighborhood development program to assure that this promising addition to the urban renewal program can continue at a high rate.

The conference report also contains several urgently needed provisions to provide adequate funding to local public housing authorities who, in a number of cases, are facing bankruptcy and at the same time make it possible to reduce rents for families of lowest income, particularly those on welfare.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other highly desirable provisions in this bill, such as the emergency flood program authored by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), which will make the benefit of last year's Flood Insurance Act available immediately in many areas which would otherwise have to wait another year or two before the permanent program became available. There are also a number of special provisions for small towns, such as the earmarking of 10 percent of the model cities grant funds for smaller communities without all of the limitations which apply to the more complex problems of big cities. The rural housing programs under the Farmers Home Administration would be extended to 4 years and a number of technical changes are made to assure more adequate funding and more efficient use of these programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a truly bipartisan bill which includes contributions from both sides of the aisle. It is essentially the bill which passed the House on October 23 by the overwhelming vote of 339 to 9. It is important that we agree to the conference report today to assure that our housing and urban development programs can maintain the high rate of activity needed to eliminate slums and meet our housing goals and clear the way for next year, when we expect to have under consideration additional extensive housing legislation.

(Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, my recent statement that the Congress, rather than the administration, is providing the leadership so badly needed by the Nation is borne out perfectly by today's enactment of the 1969 Housing Act. Through the outstanding efforts and leadership of our colleagues, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. PATMAN, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, Mr. BARRETT, a bare-bones administration bill has been turned into an important piece of legislation which is highly responsive to the needs of the people.

I commend these two distinguished gentlemen who have played such a critical role in the passage of so many important housing bills over the past 20 years. The 1969 act is another example of their legislative skills.

As many Members know, the administration's housing bill, introduced in early July, sought simply to extend our housing and urban development programs and to make perfecting changes in them. Through the efforts of the Subcommittee on Housing and the full Banking and Currency Committee, a major bill was developed, reported unanimously by the committee's members, and passed overwhelmingly by the entire House, 339 to 9.

As passed by the Congress today, the act has several extremely important provisions:

First, it authorizes a \$1.5 billion special assistance program for the purchase at par of mortgages on low-cost homes, up to \$17,500 generally and up to \$20,000

in high-cost areas. We urge the administration to use these funds promptly. They will provide badly needed help to thousands of moderate-income families who are unable to buy homes without paying high discounts.

Second it directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out an emergency flood insurance program during the 2-year period ending December 31, 1971. Through this period, insurance could be provided while the long-term permanent program is made operational through completion of the rate studies now going on.

Third, it greatly increases the authorizations for the urban renewal and model cities programs. The \$1.7 billion is authorized for urban renewal in fiscal year 1971, which together with unused authority will permit a funding level of nearly \$2.3 billion. The \$600 million is provided for the model cities program, bringing total authorization for fiscal year 1971 to \$1.4 billion.

The act also provides that at least 35 percent of urban renewal funds available in the current fiscal year and fiscal year 1971 shall be used for the neighborhood development program. As many Members know, earlier this year, it appeared that the administration would sharply curtail this promising program.

The act also makes special provision for smaller cities and counties in receiving grants under the model cities program. It provides that in cities or counties with populations of less than 100,000, HUD may make supplemental grants without regard to the formula in present law restricting grants to 80 percent of the local share of grant-in-aid projects involved in the model city program.

Fourth, it makes important changes in the rural housing program in order to assure that our farm housing needs are not neglected. The act extends the farm housing program for 4 years and substantially increases the funds available to the Farmers Home Administration to carry on its programs.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other noteworthy provisions in this act. The point I would like to stress, however, is that these major provisions were added to the legislation by the Congress, and not proposed by the administration. Again, the Congress, not the administration, took the initiative and fashioned important legislation.

As important as this act is, however, our urban and rural housing needs continue to be critical. Mr. PATMAN and Mr. BARRETT have assured me that there will be a major housing bill in 1969 and, hopefully, the administration will present some major proposals at that time. In any event, I am certain that the Banking and Currency Committee and the Subcommittee on Housing will once again deal effectively with the Nation's housing problems.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the chairman. I do not believe I will take the 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and urge its adoption. We had a lengthy conference and we ironed out a lot of differences. The posi-

tion which the House took in its bill was retained in a majority of instances. I think we did protect in the conference the House position.

There is something I would like to call to the attention of the Members which is contained in the committee report under the "tandem plan" which appears on page 28 and goes over to page 29. There are two lines at the end of that section of the report which say:

It is also Congress' intent that it be used to support single-family home mortgages under Section 517(a) in HUD's 235 program.

Mr. Speaker, on October 21 when this bill was before the House I, personally, took the position quite to the contrary, outlining why the tandem plan should be limited to multifamily housing only. I warned then of the possible grave consequences of any attempt to broaden this operation.

The use of the tandem plan to subsidize points in the multifamily housing program can be justified because costs are certified and a portion of the point subsidy can be passed on to the low-income tenants. This pass-through is not possible with single-family mortgages.

In the conference, to the very best of my recollection, we did not discuss or vote on the application of this section to housing under section 517(a). I regret very much that this erroneous statement is embodied in the committee report which is in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly endorse what the gentleman has said. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering the conference report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969. When this measure was before the House, I proposed an amendment to section 109 of the bill which would amend section 236 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. Specifically, section 236 is the interest subsidization program.

The Members of this body are aware that the section 202 of the National Housing Act of 1956 provided for direct 3-percent loans from the Government to housing projects for the elderly and handicapped. Last year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, through orders from the Bureau of the Budget began to phase out this program and force all 202 applicants to apply under the new 236 program. This has caused numerous problems. In order to attempt to cope with some of these problems, I introduced an amendment which was adopted by the full House. I will not go into a deep explanation of this amendment of the reasons behind it at this time.

The main purpose of my amendment was to make sure that certain provisions of the 236 program would not be applied to elderly housing projects. All applicants for elderly housing projects who apply under the 236 program must sign a regulatory agreement which contains the following language:

The owner covenant and agree that preference for occupancy shall be given to those (elderly or handicapped) families displaced from an urban renewal area, or as a result of governmental action or as a result of a disaster determined by the President to be a major disaster, and to those (elderly or handicapped) families whose incomes are within the lowest practicable limits for obtaining rental units in the project.

There are numerous other sections of this agreement which are highly disputable and I attempted to rectify them with my amendment. In today's mail, I received a letter from Neal H. Hardy, Acting Administrator of the Housing and Development Administration. In Mr. Hardy's letter, he supports my amendment and gives some sound reasons for his support. I hereby insert Mr. Hardy's letter in the RECORD:

HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT
ADMINISTRATION,

New York, N.Y., November 17, 1969.

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLACKBURN: I understand that at the forthcoming Senate House conference on the 1969 Housing Bill a proposal of yours on the subject of housing for the elderly will be reviewed for adoption. I am referring to the recommendation that Section 236 of the Housing and Urban Development Act be amended to provide that housing for the elderly be defined and administered in the same fundamental terms as found under Section 202 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1959.

The experience of the N.Y.C. Housing and Development Administration leads me to believe that this is a very constructive step, and I am writing to express my vigorous support of its passage. It is clear that the unique requirements of housing for the elderly will be jeopardized if the processing procedure of Section 202 are standardized to the common denominator of general Section 236 housing. The simplified procedures under Section 202, involving a minimum of paperwork and delays, were especially well suited to the often inexperienced sponsors of housing for the elderly and I am convinced that the supply of housing for the elderly will in the long run suffer a setback through this change.

In view of the outstanding advantage of your proposal and the critical need for housing for the elderly, I strongly urge favorable action on your amendment. It will contribute to the furtherance of housing for the elderly and help achieve a sound and effective bill.

Sincerely yours,

NEAL J. HARDY,
Acting Administrator.

The 236 program contains some very difficult procedures which must be followed in order to obtain loans under this program, whereas the 202 program was very simply and easily handled by church groups which were not familiar with this program. I received several letters from church groups in my area which were concerned with this problem and for the information of my colleagues, I am hereby inserting them into the RECORD:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing you with reference to our pending project for which we have made application under Section 202. It has come to our attention that there is some consideration being given to altering the Section 202 program to come under the F.H.A. Section 236.

We would like to strongly register our preference for the Section 202 program for housing the elderly over the F.H.A. approach. We are convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that the conditions here in greater Atlanta would be far better served with the sponsoring organization left in full control rather than becoming an extension administrative agency for the F.H.A.

On the basis of our research we have formed the conviction that the Section 202 program for housing the elderly as it has been successfully enacted over the past several years is much more desirable than the costly builder-centered F.H.A. approach.

We respectfully request that you exert the influence of your office to insure the continuation of the 202 program.

Very respectfully yours,

ARCHIE B. CRENSHAW,
President, Decatur Church of Christ,
Senior Housing, Inc.

MARCH 13, 1969.

HON. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban
Development, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you with reference to our pending project for which we have made application under Section 202. It has come to our attention that there is some consideration being given to altering the Section 202 program to come under the F.H.A. Section 236.

We would like to strongly register our preference for the Section 202 program for housing the elderly over the F.H.A. approach. We are convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that the condition here in greater Atlanta would be far better served with the sponsoring organization left in full control rather than becoming an extension administrative agency for the F.H.A. On the basis of our research we have formed the conviction that the Section 202 program for housing the elderly as it has been successfully enacted over the past several years is much more desirable than the costly builder-center F.H.A. approach.

In this connection we would like to commend to you Mr. Richard L. Fullerton who has as much experience in this field of endeavor on any person in the United States as a genuine authority on this subject. He carries our full confidence. We request that you receive him as you would receive a specific delegation from the Decatur Church of Christ Senior Housing, Incorporated.

Sincerely yours,

ARCHIE B. CRENSHAW,
President, Decatur Church of Christ
Senior Housing, Inc.

DECATUR PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Decatur, Ga., September 11, 1969.

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLACKBURN: Thank you for your letter of September 8, in response to mine dealing with our Retirement Home project here.

The point of genuine concern for us is that the copy of the 236 Housing Program Regulations to which you refer does not in any way reflect the changes which were promised in our conversation with Secretary Romney. The 202 criteria on which we have based our application provides for the

MARCH 13, 1969.

elderly. The 236 Housing Program only indirectly makes it possible for elderly people to be in such a home, but priority is given for those displaced by Urban Renewal and other needs. Therefore, it would be exceedingly important for us to have a revised copy which would show that the applications under Section 202 are to be funded under 236 but the criteria for occupancy would be the same.

You can see that if we came up to the time when the loan was closed and the low bid accepted and discovered that we have a Regulatory Agreement which follows the old Section 236 pattern, we would be in great difficulty.

The conditional commitment to which you refer was received by Atlanta Area Presbyterian Homes after my letter had been mailed to Secretary Romney last week. I regret that the two communications crossed.

We still need clarification concerning the nature of the Regulatory Agreement. We are proceeding, of course, with working drawings and will have them available shortly.

With all good wishes and appreciation, I am,

Cordially yours,

JAMES DAVISON PHILIPS.

FALENDER HOMES CORP.,
Indianapolis, Ind., June 4, 1969.

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLACKBURN: It is most important that the 221(D)(3) housing program be continued so that below-market interest rates will be available for families who are not eligible for assistance under other programs. Many families who need housing assistance are not eligible under Sections 235 and 236.

The interest subsidy programs have lower income limits than the 221(D)(3) program. Moreover, they exclude many needy families from subsidies due to the requirement that the family spend such a large percentage of its income for housing. To meet the needs of these families and avoid creating a gap in the housing program, it is imperative that the 221(4)(3) program be continued. It will serve families of moderate income who are not eligible for interest subsidies but who urgently need help to obtain decent housing.

The 1968 Housing Act authorized \$500-million of additional special assistance funds to become available on July 1, 1969. We strongly oppose the recommendation of the President that this authorization be canceled. These special assistance funds were authorized by Congress and they are needed. These funds should be permitted to become available on July 1 of this year in order to continue the 221(D)(3) program which has been so successful.

Knowing that the Congress has authorized the 221(D)(3) funds, many people have relied upon this legislation. Applications have been filed for financing under this proposal. Congress should keep faith with the people who prepared projects for the moderate income group to be served by the 221(D)(3) program. These projects will help to meet the critical problems in our communities.

We will appreciate your help in assuring that these 221(D)(3) funds will be available.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK J. FALENDER.

THE PATH ASSOCIATION,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 29, 1969.

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BLACKBURN: It is most important that the 221(d)(3) housing program be continued so that below-market interest rates will be available for loans to nonprofit housing organizations. Such organizations have been formed in many cities

for the purpose of providing housing for families of low and moderate incomes. The 221(d)(3) program is necessary to serve families who are not eligible for assistance under other programs. Many families who need housing assistance are not eligible under Sections 235 and 236.

The 235 and 236 program have lower income limits than the 221(d)(3) program. They also exclude many moderate income families from interest subsidies because they require the family to spend a larger percentage of its income for housing. To meet the needs of these families and avoid creating a gap in the housing program, it is necessary that the 221(d)(3) program be continued. It will serve lower income families who are not eligible for interest subsidies but who need help so they can get adequate homes.

The 1968 Housing Act authorized \$500 million of additional special assistance funds to become available on July 1, 1969. We strongly oppose the recommendation of the President that this authorization be repealed. These special assistance funds are needed. They should become available on July 1 of this year as authorized by Congress in order to continue the 221(d)(3) program which has been so successful.

After Congress authorized the 221(d)(3) funds, nonprofit organizations acted in reliance upon this legislation. They filed applications for financing under 221(d)(3). Congress should keep faith with these nonprofit organizations who prepared projects for the people of modest incomes who will be served by the 221(d)(3) program. These projects are needed to meet the urgent problems in our communities.

We will be grateful for your help in keeping these 221(d)(3) funds available.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. STREETER,
President.

Also, I received a communication from the Community Council of Greater New York concerning my amendment with their endorsement. I hereby insert my letter into the RECORD:

COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF

GREATER NEW YORK,

New York, N.Y., November 21, 1969.

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BLACKBURN: Attached please find a copy of our letter to Representative Barrett about the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969. We have also written to the other conferees.

We appreciate your support of the Section 202 program, as either a separate entity or as a separate processing procedure within Section 236. Please let us know if there is anything further we can do to support your efforts to provide for the elderly.

Very truly yours,

JAMES W. FOGARTY,
Executive Director.

NOVEMBER 19, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARRETT: We have studied carefully the provisions of both S. 2864 and H.R. 13827. We find that the provisions enumerated below most closely meet the current critical housing needs of the elderly, and we urge your consideration of these items in the Senate-House Conference.

(1) We are pleased that both the Senate and the House bills noted that the Section 202 program providing direct loans for housing for the elderly was effective and efficient, and had met with widespread popular approval. Both bills therefore support the retention of Section 202 separate from Section

236. We agree with this assessment and strongly urge either the retention of Section 202 as a separate program for senior citizens, or separate processing for housing for the elderly within Section 236. The Senate authorized \$80 million per year for three years while the House provided \$150 million for fiscal 1969. We urge the authorization of the largest possible allocation, for each of three years, to assure the smooth functioning of this crucial program.

(2) We favor Section 211 of the Senate bill, which authorizes subsidies in public low-rent housing projects for tenants whose incomes are too low to meet even these rents. The House bill has no such provision. Subsidies are imperative for many tenants in low-rent public housing. Many elderly, for example, now pay from 50% to 70% of their monthly income for rent in public housing. In his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Housing, Representative William F. Ryan pointed out that many families cannot afford to pay more than 20% of their income for rent. We, too, advocate changing Section 211 of S. 2864 to provide federal subsidy of that portion of the rent above 20% of the tenant's income. Should this change not be effected, we would reluctantly support the Senate's proposed 25% figure.

(3) We strongly support Section 116 of S. 2864 which raises the permissible percentage of subsidized apartments built under Section 236 from 20% to 40%. (The bill passed by the House contains no such provision.) This increase to 40% is without any question important to all sections of the population, but particularly to the elderly, as it increases their housing opportunities in existing buildings. It is one of the most valuable provisions of the 1969 Housing Act.

(4) We favor Section 208 of S. 2864, increasing the per-room construction cost ceiling in federally assisted housing according to a flexible scale. The parallel provision in H.R. 13827, Section 210, provides only for a 10% increase in room cost limits. The House proposal is not adequate. The spiraling nature of construction costs has already outdated the 10% figure, and would not cover current construction costs in New York City. We will continue to have a shortage of federally-assisted, moderate-rental housing unless the flexible scale of the Senate measure is enacted.

We urge retention of the amendment to H.R. 13827, which requires an urban renewal project to include at least as many units of low-and-middle-income housing as the area had before urban renewal.

New Yorkers particularly feel the national housing crisis, because of the high cost of living in this city. The programs and authorizations we support are aimed at alleviating some of the housing problems of poor elderly people, and are therefore worthy of the Congress' wholehearted commitment.

We count on you to press for their adoption in the Senate-House Conference.

Very truly yours,

JAMES W. FOGARTY,
Executive Director.

In conclusion, I feel very strongly that if the present situation is allowed to continue, we will find a significant decrease in housing projects for the elderly. I feel that my amendments were the only way in which we could preserve this vitally needed program. Unfortunately, HUD objects because they feel that we are "infringing upon administrative authority."

Several of the administrators of this program have come to me and told me that even though the 236 program does require that certain preferences be given to low-income families over church applicants, they were going to overlook this.

However, when I discussed this matter with the general counsel's office of HUD, they informed me that the law would be enforced in its strictest terms. I would like to remind the House that the churches are the ones building these housing projects for their own members. Under my amendment this conflict would not exist since we would take the already existing 202 program and apply it, and there would not be any conflicts involved.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I sent to Senator JOHN SPARKMAN outlining my reasons for this amendment. I urge my colleagues to seriously consider this amendment and in the future I will again bring this matter before the House for its deliberation:

NOVEMBER 21, 1969.

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Banking
and Currency, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, you will soon be in a conference with the House conferees on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. Section 109 of the bill as passed by the House contains a set of amendments which I introduced. These amendments would set up a new criteria to be applied for 236 interest subsidy loans when granted to projects for the elderly and handicapped.

Specifically, I am attempting to take as much of the criteria as found under the old 202 program and apply it to elderly housing under 236. The first part of my amendment would require that elderly housing projects shall be defined and administered in the same fundamental terms as found under Section 202 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1959. Specifically this amendment would take much of the administrative procedure as found under the old 202 program and apply it to 236. I have had the opportunity of helping groups in my area convert from 202 to 236 because of the mandate issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The regulatory agreement which each group will be forced to sign contains the following provision:

"Section 7(d) Preference for occupancy shall be given to those elderly or handicapped families displaced from an urban renewal area or as a result of governmental action or as a result of disaster determined by the President to be a major disaster and to those elderly or handicapped families whose incomes are in the lowest practicable limits for obtaining units in the project."

This language has been a source of concern to many of the project planners in my area. They fear that, unlike the 202 program, when the project is completed persons who are not members of the church groups will be given preference to obtain housing in those projects. There is a great fear that the project will be turned into a low income housing unit which will be forced to take anyone meeting the standards established by the FHA. Under 202 the church groups were relatively well-assured that only their own members would be living in these apartments.

The second part of my amendment requires that the rents be established at a break-even level, and the requirement that 25% of a tenant's income would be used as rent would be waived. The reason behind this amendment is to guarantee that the project receives revenue adequate for its operation. However, under the 25% criteria any excess revenue would be transferred to the Department of Housing and Urban De-

velopment. I do not believe that HUD should be making money from our older citizens. These are the people who have been working for thirty or forty years and have usually been paying the bulk of the taxes. I believe that at least in their retirement years they should be able to receive a fair deal from their government.

Thirdly, my amendment would set income limits for tenants in a project. We would continue to use the criteria of 135% of that which is required under the public housing program. However, we would set up a second category which would state that the tenant's income shall not exceed \$5500 for a single person and \$6600 for a couple. I feel that this ceiling is adequate for the elderly and it guarantees that only those elderly persons who cannot provide for themselves are allowed to obtain housing in these projects.

Fourthly, there are no objections from any source concerning changing the income verification section from two years to every five years or at such other times as the Secretary shall determine.

I would appreciate your giving consideration to my amendments. I know that the Department is opposed but I feel that you might be sympathetic to my position in light of the fact that you are the author of the 202 section of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1959. Also, I feel very strongly that my amendments are needed in light of the expenses of the different groups being forced to convert from the 202 to the 236 program.

Any assistance you could be to me in this matter would be sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,

BEN B. BLACKBURN,
Member of Congress, Fourth District,
Georgia.

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. WIDNALL) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, this year's housing bill is a collection of various amendments to existing housing and urban development programs. The spending authority is in the billions, but in light of the pressing needs we face in our urban centers, it can be little else. It is a 1-year bill, as the House preferred. We intend to keep the administrative nose to the grindstone by coming back next year.

This year, we also have a housing bill which is mostly, and emphatically, amendments arising from within the Congress. There are the extensions of basic HUD programs and a few HUD amendments. But the real Romney program has yet to come. It will arrive shortly.

This year's bill, therefore, reflects the work of the Congress. And some of the changes we are making in ongoing programs are highly significant.

For instance, Senator BROOKE introduced an amendment substantially altering the character of the public housing program. Ten years ago, in 1959, when we revised that program in the name of local autonomy, we had no intention of allowing local public housing authorities to charge higher and higher rents to the poor people as a means of avoiding bankruptcy. Yet, the much higher costs of today are no longer able to be financed out of rental income and in many cases public housing rents now greatly exceed tenants' ability to pay.

The Brooke amendment assures that those who qualify for public housing need pay no more than 25 percent of their income for rent. And, I might add, this ceiling of 25 percent should not encourage housing authorities to begin raising rents to that level. Seventy-five percent of the tenants still pay less than 25 percent.

In connection with public housing, Mr. Speaker, we were especially concerned about the incidents of mismanagement in local housing authorities that have been reported. High operating costs, and deteriorating conditions due to inefficient or lax management cannot be tolerated.

On the other hand, there must be a greater degree of tenant responsibility as well. Irresponsible tenant behavior jeopardizes the future of this program and therefore must be corrected.

There are other amendments I would call to the Members' attention. In the urban renewal program, the provision extending the period of eligibility for non-cash grants-in-aid by 1 year is an especially important one. It reflects the delays and problems encountered by HUD in connection with the neighborhood development program. It has taken about 1 year to understand the problems inherent in the program, and this amendment recognizes that fact, and attempts to deal with it so that local communities will not lose what they are entitled to.

Another amendment I am particularly happy to support, and strongly, is the one providing \$150 million for the elderly housing program, section 202.

This 202 3-percent program has been highly successful, and popular, especially because it involves local nonprofit groups in sponsoring the housing. It is one with which I associated myself in the legislation of 1956 and to which I then, as now, gave strong support.

Last year, when we were passing the interest-subsidy program, section 236, we gave HUD authority to convert the 202 projects into 236 projects. We did so because this took a Government-loan program into private-loan program involving smaller amounts of the subsidy.

However, when we did so, we intended only for this authority to be used when and if the sponsors wished. HUD misinterpreted the conversion feature and began requiring all 202 sponsors to convert automatically, whether or not they wanted to.

We intended this authority to be purely voluntary. We insist on that position today, in the managers' statement, and I strongly support that position. We like the 202 program; we have authorized an additional \$150 million for it, and we want the conversions to occur on a purely voluntary basis.

I urge our colleagues to approve the conference report.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, first I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, Mr. BARRETT, and to the chairman of the full Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. PATMAN, for the excellent leadership they have provided in working out the details of this very important and comprehensive housing bill. All of

the House conferees, including Mr. WIDNALL and his colleagues on the minority side, worked hard and effectively on the legislation, too. As the ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee, I am delighted to join in recommending this conference report to the House and urge its adoption.

One of the most troublesome problems we confronted in the conference had to do with a Senate amendment dealing with public housing. The Senate had proposed adding \$75 million to the annual subsidy for public housing to enable housing authorities with a high percentage of very low-income tenants to reduce rents to a level of 25 percent of income. The amendment was well-intentioned, because the poorest people in the projects were often required to pay the highest percentage of their income for housing—much more than welfare families in many jurisdictions could afford unless they received food stamps to enable them to eat a nearly adequate diet—and the food stamps are not yet available in every jurisdiction—these people had a "Hobson's choice" of either purchasing housing and very little else, or purchasing food and living in unimaginable slums.

It has been the policy of Congress for years that low-income tenants in public housing not be required to pay more than 20 percent of their income for shelter. But many housing authorities found it impossible to conform to this standard, particularly as more and more of their public housing families came from the lowest income levels—on welfare. Minimum rents in public housing in St. Louis and elsewhere eventually rose to a level of 50 percent or more of their total income. Even with food stamps, the welfare families in our public housing projects have found it impossible to approach a minimum standard of living for survival. Yet, despite the high rental levels which the housing authority had to impose in order to meet operating costs, the authority has been in serious financial jeopardy, heading toward bankruptcy. Finally, the authority acceded to community demands to reduce rents to the 25-percent level.

The House-passed bill had a provision in it intended to help ameliorate this problem authorizing additional subsidies to housing authorities to help meet part of their operating deficits. The Senate amendment, which went further by specifying a \$75 million added subsidy, promised much but actually provided little, for, according to the information I obtained from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, none of the funds included in that Senate provision would have helped St. Louis or any other public housing authority which had already reduced rents to a maximum of 25 percent.

In conference, we worked out new language which will benefit all housing authorities unable to meet operating costs out of rental income. But this is not an automatic grant of funds merely because an authority is in fiscal trouble. The authority must take necessary steps to upgrade management policies to assure tenant responsibility, so that

the tragic specter of vandalized public housing units and of whole projects can be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is comprehensive and explicit on this point, and is of such importance to the future of public housing that this language deserves particular emphasis in connection with our consideration of the conference report. Therefore, I submit the appropriate paragraphs of the Statement of the managers on the part of the House, entitled "Additional Aid for Very Low-Income Tenants," as follows:

ADDITIONAL AID FOR VERY LOW-INCOME TENANTS

The Senate bill contained a provision not in the House amendment adding a new section 24 to the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 authorizing up to \$75 million per year in contracts for annual rental assistance payments to public housing agencies to cover the amount by which rental charges allocated to a unit exceed 25 percent of the tenant's income and to provide improved operating and maintenance services.

Both the Senate (sec. 206(a)) and House (sec. 210(a)) bills also contained a provision making it clear that the Secretary of HUD has authority to fix the amount of annual contributions in excess of debt service requirements of the project so long as the fixed contribution does not exceed the statutory annual maximum.

The Conference substitute retains the basic concept of section 211 of the Senate bill by generally limiting rents that may be charged public housing tenants to no more than 25 percent of their income. It provides Federal funds to cover the amount by which the appropriate rental charges exceed 25 percent of the income of the tenant and to cover the cost of adequate operating and maintenance services.

The conferees were concerned, however, that in a number of jurisdictions the benefits of limiting the rent which may be charged a tenant of public housing would not inure to those tenants receiving public welfare assistance, but would be captured by the public agencies administering the programs of assistance to these families.

The conferees realize the impracticability of attempting to provide through additional public housing subsidies the funding needed to make adequate the welfare payments provided by the various States. The conferees, therefore, have made clear that the requirement that the rents fixed by public housing agencies may not exceed one-fourth of a tenant's income shall not apply in any case in which the Secretary of HUD determines that limiting the rent of any tenant, or class of tenants, will result in a reduction in the amount of welfare assistance which would otherwise be provided to such tenant, or class of tenants, by the public agency.

The conferees are disturbed by the growing practice of stretching an inadequate welfare budget by placing in public housing increasing numbers of families who cannot pay even the operating costs of the unit they occupy. The conferees are hopeful that within the context of the welfare program, some means can be found to provide as much support for a welfare family in public housing as would be provided for that family in private housing. Accordingly, the Secretaries of HEW and HUD are requested to study the feasibility of developing a uniform policy concerning the rents which shall be paid in public housing for families whose rents come from public assistance.

The conference substitute deletes the provisions on section 211 of the Senate bill which authorized \$75 million in contracts for rental assistance payments under a new

section 24, on the basis that assistance for this purpose can be provided within the existing annual contributions framework as clarified by the bill, and transfer the \$75 million to the authorization for annual contributions contracts provided under section 10(e) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937.

The conferees intend that the Secretary's authority to make annual contributions in excess of debt service requirements may be used, to the extent that the statutory annual maximum permits, for (1) payments to cover existing operating deficits of public housing agencies and enable them to maintain adequate operating and maintenance services and reserve funds, and (2) additional payments to make up the amount by which the proportionate share of operating and maintenance expenses attributable to a public housing tenant's dwelling unit exceeds 25 percent of the tenant's income. The additional payments which are contemplated in clause (2) above may not be made with respect to a dwelling unit unless the rent paid for the unit is one-fourth of the tenant's income and such payments shall not be provided to make up any reduction in the amount of welfare assistance which is provided to a tenant.

The committee is deeply concerned over cases of lax management in many public housing projects which have led to high operating costs, deterioration of property, and an intolerable environment for the families who live there. Among the reasons given to the committee to demonstrate the need for additional subsidies for existing housing projects, a sharp increase in vandalism was frequently mentioned together with a sharp increase in crime which has driven many occupants out of the projects. Much of the blame for these conditions lies with project managers and local government officials. Too frequently individual projects have filled up with problem families to the exclusion of others with resulting vacancy rates which have caused local budget deficits.

The low-rent public housing program has a fundamental role to play in meeting the needs of low income families and a special importance in making possible urban renewal and other programs which result in displacement. It would be disastrous if the small but growing number of cases of mismanagement undercut the program by giving rise to public reaction against them and by driving out responsible families of low income. HUD should undertake promptly a review of its own local management guides with a view toward tightening them where necessary. At the same time it should make its own inspection and review of local practices to assure that project managers know the standards expected of them and fully enforce their own regulations. Project managers who do not enforce these standards are not doing the job expected of them by the Congress.

The conferees wish to make it clear that the benefits of subsidized public housing, including those provided by this section, cannot be achieved without tenant responsibility, including responsibility for the protection and care of property. Irresponsible tenant behavior jeopardizes the future of this program and cannot be tolerated.

The conferees do not intend that all tenants in public housing should pay 25 percent of income for rent. Prior to the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959, giving local authorities autonomy over this and other tenant relationships, Federal law set as a rule that rents in public housing should be no more than one-fifth of income. Regrettably, upward pressures on local authority costs have forced cities to raise rents. The Congress has on several occasions provided special additional payments to maintain the low-income character of public housing projects to meet the basic financial needs of local authorities

through provisions such as the supplementary \$10 per month provided for the elderly and handicapped and for families of very low income and for large families. The conferees wish to make it clear that nothing in this or any other section of this bill is intended as a substitute for such existing authorized contributions. The additional \$75 million authorized by section 211 of the Senate bill is being provided as additional annual contributions contract authorization specifically for the payments contemplated above.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969. I commend the gentlemen of both Houses for their foresight by including insurance for losses from water-caused mudslides in the flood insurance program.

Mudslides, resulting from accumulations of water on or under the ground, have been particularly distressing to residents of California. The damages caused by mudslides have been great—creating personal hardships and economic distress to the victims of this unforeseen disaster.

Many factors have made it uneconomical for the private insurance industry alone to make flood insurance available on reasonable terms and conditions to those in need of such protection.

Under this act, the Federal Government, in cooperation with the private insurance industry, will provide a program of pooling risks, minimizing costs and distributing burdens equitably among those who will be protected by flood insurance and the general public.

I have long felt that the need for this program exists. With the lessons learned from the flood insurance program, I hope that the Congress would see fit to extend the program to include earthquake insurance, such as I have proposed in H.R. 14781.

Again, I commend the gentlemen of both Houses for recognizing the need of this program and for taking swift action in aiding in the alleviation of a portion of the distress caused by floods and mudslides.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I have several comments on the conference report on S. 2864, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969.

Included in the report is the amendment offered by Senator Brooke, which provides public housing to tenants of very low income who would otherwise not be able to afford it.

Seventy-five million a year is authorized for annual rental assistance payments made by the Secretary to make up the difference between the tenant's rent and the amount of money necessary to operate the project—including better operating and maintenance services.

Unfortunately, the conferees did not include my amendment, which was adopted on October 22, 1969, when the bill was before the House to lower from 25 percent to 20 percent the part of the tenant's income that is spent for rent in the section 236 program and in the rent supplement program.

The section 235 program allows the owner of a private home to pay only 20 percent of his income, and he also receives a tax deduction on the interest payments he makes.

But the section 236 renter not only receives no tax benefit, but also he is forced to pay 25 percent of his income.

The same situation applies to the rent supplement program. Rents are high, and large families have to pay rents they cannot afford. My amendment would have lowered the part of the person's income to be paid from 25 percent to 20 percent.

It is inequitable to require city dwellers who rent their apartments under the section 236 program or the rent supplement program to pay more than they can afford. Like the section 235 homeowners, they are affected by the high cost of living.

I regret that the conference committee did not see fit to include this in their package. Unfortunately, the problem still exists. And sooner or later the Congress will have to correct it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the conference report on S. 2864.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12321) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) temporarily assume the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12321, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chairman recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Within the last few hours, opponents of H.R. 12321, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969, have produced a second version of their substitute bill.

I might as well make it clear from the start: This second version is as odious as the first.

Neither can be accepted by those of us who believe that the effort upon which we embarked in 1964 is worthwhile.

Both versions strike at the heart of the economic opportunity programs. Both are calculated to destroy the concept of community action—the most creative and innovative development in American Government in our generation.

In its short life, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been the birthplace of a substantial number of programs which are now well established and accepted on both sides of the aisle of this House.

This is not to say, of course, that it has been without blemish. Twice, in 1966 and 1967, the Committee on Education and Labor and the Congress itself acted to rectify faults that became apparent as the new machinery settled into its work.

It had been my hope that, much earlier in the year, we could lay before this House a bill to extend the basic legislation, and to provide for such constructive amendments as were necessary to insure the orderly operation of the OEO programs.

But, Mr. Chairman, events have rendered that procedure both impossible and useless.

Today we are obliged to concentrate our efforts not so much on perfecting the operation of OEO, as simply on saving its life.

For there is no blinking at the fact that in carrying out the directives given to it by Congress, the Office of Economic Opportunity has made enemies. That is one measure of its success.

Those enemies have a goal toward which they have pushed since the day OEO's potential was first recognized. That goal has been and is the complete destruction of the agency and its major programs.

I do not say that it is the goal of those who support the substitute measure to be put before us. But I would caution my colleagues to look carefully at the probable consequences of a successful effort to pass the substitute. I place my confidence in the hundreds of community leaders across this country who have indicated their belief in the strongest possible terms that the substitute spells disaster for their local efforts.

If this effort to substitute succeeds, Members of this House may just as well say goodbye to a coordinated national effort to better the economic lot of the poor. We shall not have to waste more breath in talking about "community action" or "maximum feasible participation of the poor." We shall not have to say any more about "local determination" or "local initiative."

A vote for this substitute will have said it all. And, the Congress will have turned its back on the most innovative, con-

structive approach taken to date toward solution of the problems of the poor.

Five years is but a little time for an undertaking so broad. The remarkable thing is not that the goals we established are yet unreached. The marvel is that OEO has made any discernible progress at all—and it has certainly done that.

Let us look briefly at the record of accomplishment over the past 5 years.

OEO, in the first year of its existence was the initiator of the Headstart program. That program has now served more than 3.3 million of the country's neediest children, and has provided new employment and training opportunities for over 100,000 people. It is accepted everywhere as a great step forward in the handling of the problems of child development.

OEO was also the initiator of the legal services program. Under that program, nearly 2,000 lawyers are now providing legal assistance to over 800,000 poor people a year.

OEO also developed the Upward Bound program. That program has enabled 50,000 young men and women to prepare themselves to enter college—young men and women for whom college would not otherwise have been possible.

OEO began the Foster Grandparents program, under which 3,000 of the elderly poor have been given opportunities to earn money by helping institutionalized children.

OEO also developed comprehensive health centers. Today 49 of these centers are bringing comprehensive medical care to 300,000 poor.

OEO's programs for American Indians have begun to move us away from the patronizing paternalism which has so long characterized the Federal relationships with the Indian tribes.

OEO has funded some 2,800 neighborhood service centers. These centers bring needed social services, or reliable information on where to get them, to some 3,500,000 low-income persons.

And, OEO's income maintenance experiments, universally regarded as representing the best of experimentation in handling the problems of poverty, were the forerunner of President Nixon's proposals in the welfare area.

In the manpower area, as well, great strides have been made in the 5 years of the poverty program.

Two and one quarter million youths from low-income families have been enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Private industry has received support to train nearly 270,444 hard-core unemployed or underemployed adults in the JOBS program.

Approximately 70,000 people are enrolled in comprehensive employment programs.

Nearly 37,000 older persons from severely distressed rural areas have obtained jobs and training through Operation Mainstream.

And, 10,000 poor have found opportunities for advancement in the New Careers program.

Despite this record, some in this House would kill OEO outright, and have the courage to say so. Others would like to

see it wrecked, but would do the job by indirection.

Still others, would keep it alive and out in front, like a puppet mandarin, but with sharply reduced role and limited effectiveness.

Then there are others who would simply want the States to run the programs. But their uncertainty over just how the States are going to do this is evidenced by last-minute changes in the draft substitute which was first displayed last week.

Now, with a coalition of interests like that, there is little wonder that the substitute is a patchwork of compromise—painfully explicit in one version, foggy and indefinite in the next. The same variations in clarity occur from section to section within any given version.

Nor is it surprising, Mr. Chairman, that a plan like this was hatched up in the dark, kept secret from the committee that has oversight of the legislation, and announced—but not released—at a press conference less than 24 hours before it was scheduled to be considered by the House last week.

It is equally unremarkable that the revised version, too, was kept secret and out of sight while the Members of this House busied themselves for a week on version I.

This is a strange way to legislate, particularly on a program as broad and far reaching as this.

The action contemplated by the substitute—either version—is nothing less than a disavowal of the basic philosophy that has underlain the economic opportunity legislation from the start.

That philosophy has been simply stated in two words "community action."

It embodies a concerted effort to marshal local resources—both human and financial, private and governmental—to solve local problems. It assumes that local people are rational, intelligent beings, competent to work out their own problems if they have the necessary technical services available to them. This applies to the poor as well as the affluent.

All of this is tossed overboard by the Johnny-come-lately substitutes. This latest proposal makes a mockery of concepts such as "participation of the poor," "participation of locally elected officials," and "local control" of economic opportunity programs.

We delude ourselves if we think the substitute proposals are simply a "restructuring" of community action. They destroy community action.

In essence, the substitutes would turn the whole range of community action programs over to the Governors of the 50 States. It delivers into the hands of the State economic opportunity offices—that is, plainly speaking, the Governors—a stranglehold over local initiative, and local participation.

The State domination implicit in the substitutes is so broad and so loosely bridled that local agencies become captives of the Governors' every whim, bias, or caprice.

The 5-year experiment in local initiative, local decision, and local control would become a program of the Governors, by the Governors, and for the Governors.

Now, the argument is made by some sponsors of the substitutes that although the State offices have broad latitude in approving or disapproving applications sent in by local agencies, the OEO director may still override. But this override is based upon a finding by the Director that approval would strengthen the overall program plan of a local community action agency.

This appears to be a considerable departure from the version which we had the privilege of studying for the past week. Under that draft, the override would have been based on a finding by the Director that disapproval would seriously weaken the overall program plan.

Now, this new approach, in a more recent draft, appears to offer some measure of protection for local initiative and local control.

But in the context of the overall thrust of the substitute proposals, the new veto authority for States offices is clearly an effort to strengthen the State role. I say to my colleagues that this will be at the expense of the local communities.

Mr. Chairman, the implications of various sections of the substitute go far, far beyond the scope of community action programs, operating in some obscure county or town in some remote section of the land. Neighborhood Youth Corps, JOBS, all title I manpower programs—in fact, all programs funded under the Economic Opportunity Act—will be affected by this far-reaching proposal.

The proposed new section 251(b)(2) requires that the Director give each State office advance notice of the proposed approval or funding of any application for assistance under any title of the act, and that the State office be given an opportunity to comment upon such proposed approval or funding.

The proposed new section 251(b)(3) requires the Director to afford the State office other opportunities as may be required to play an affirmative role in all programs financed by the act. This, I need not remind you, includes title I manpower programs.

Considering these actions together, the Governors are given a vast and indefinitely bounded authority over all economic opportunity programs. It stops short of giving the Governors an absolute veto, but this House should be aware that it is a giant step in that direction.

In a sense, this whole substitute approach is a remarkable gesture because it assigns to the States a role which the States themselves have never shown great eagerness to accept.

Two years ago, we made substantial changes in the structure of community action programs in the Green amendment. But we took great care to see that the feature of local control was preserved. We made it possible for States to substantially increase their participation in the great program of grassroots action.

Even this did not result in any great rush on the part of the States to become heavily involved.

Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., a firm engaged to study implementation of the Green amendment, came to this conclusion after interviewing State officials:

Seventy-four per cent of the states never seriously considered designating a state

agency as CAA. The commitment to local initiative was strong in these states. (Hearings, Vol. 2, P. 1324)

This fact was, interestingly enough, placed in the hearing record by a spokesman for the National Governors' Conference.

It seems to me that 74 percent of the States, apparently satisfied with the existing arrangement, is a rather healthy expression of opinion.

It fortifies my own feeling that the current effort to make the antipoverty program a State operation stems from a very narrow base.

Obviously, there was no great rush on the part of States or their Governors to come before either the House Committee on Education and Labor, or the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, pressing for an approach such as that envisioned by the substitute. I would have been happy to hear anyone who came.

The only Governor who asked to come was the Governor of my own State, who decided in November that he didn't like the President's bill. I was delighted to invite him, and even he told us:

I don't want control of the OEO programs.

If this substitute is adopted, we will be saying to the poor, to local officials, and to the country that we have lost faith in local democracy—that we no longer have confidence in the capacity of local people to formulate solutions to their own problems.

We have required in previous OEO legislation that 20 percent of the total funding of CAP agencies come from local sources. The other 80 percent, of course, was Federal funds.

The substitute proposal sets up a remarkable situation whereby the State government not only could tell a local CAP agency how to spend the Federal money—but how to spend its own local money as well.

That does not square with the long-held theory that local people know how to spend their funds better than anyone else—be it the State government or the Federal Government.

From the inception of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the philosophy has developed that the poor should have a voice in the decisions affecting programs for them.

We insisted that this not be a token voice, but a real and far-reaching influence in the development of programs and policies.

More than once this body has stood up for the principle of "maximum feasible participation of the poor." We have written into the law itself the requirement that at least one-third of the governing boards of community action agencies be of the poor.

Here, again, those who come forward with this substitute proposal—either version—have turned their backs on this broad principle. Some who have stood on this floor and successfully fought for it, now seem willing and eager to cast it aside.

The substitute establishes State boards or councils to advise and oversee "community action," if it can still be called that. There is no requirement that these

councils be structured on the old principle. Nothing says that one-third of the membership shall be poor. Nothing says that one-third shall be elected officials.

I am frankly surprised and saddened that the principle has been abandoned so lightly.

As I understand the most recent substitute proposal—at any rate one of the most recent—States which opt to carry out a developmental and coordinating program for rural and urban community action begin with a clean slate. Virtually everything that has gone before is wiped away.

If the State plan does not include a Headstart-type program, then Headstart may not exist as far as that State is concerned.

If the State—meaning the Governor—decides to omit neighborhood services centers or consumer education programs from its plan for one reason or another, then the possibility of a neighborhood service center or a consumer education program will not exist there.

So it goes all down the line. The views of the poor people in the community and the insights of elected local officials are severely limited by the content of the State plan.

The danger I see is that if a city decides it needs a Headstart program in a State that does not encompass Headstart in its plan, then the children of that city may be effectively foreclosed.

If the local elected officials of an impoverished area decide they want and need a consumer education program, they are obliged to do without it if it isn't in the State plan.

I happen to be a strong States rights advocate. I believe in the authority of States to act affirmatively in the public interest. But I do not want to give any Governor or any State office the authority to deprive little children of a Headstart program, when some other child just across the State line can enjoy it.

I do not believe that we ought to give any Governor the right to deprive the poor people of any area of his State of the benefits of a consumer education program simply out of pique and spite.

This is not what we mean by States rights.

I have heard that the new draft would allow the Director to reserve funds to support title II activities and projects which are not scheduled for under the State plan.

As it has been described to me, even if 90 percent of the local community action agencies of the State are dissatisfied with the direction and design of the State program, the Director still may reserve for independent funding no more than 25 percent of the State allotment for title II.

He may do this only upon a finding that failure to fund would result in a substantial disruption of the effort to eliminate poverty in the particular State, or upon a finding that such funding is necessary to assist special emphasis programs.

On the surface, this revised language appears to provide a broader basis for independent funding. But here again, when it is considered in the context of the entire thrust of the substitute toward

wider and more effective involvement of the Governors, the new authority can only be interpreted as further limiting the prerogatives of the local communities.

The Director may fund independently a program or programs which have been determined at the Federal level to be important.

The Director may fund independently a program or programs which have implications for State efforts to eliminate poverty.

But the Director may not independently fund an individual community's locally conceived and locally designed program.

While this concerns and distresses me, it does not surprise me, for it is consistent with the philosophy of those who wish to eliminate the local community's involvement in the antipoverty program.

I submit that the substitutes are not a forward step, nor a conservative step. They are a move to junk the investment the Nation has already made and to deny the experience gained during the past 5 years.

The new administration has concluded that the existing statutory authority provides an adequate base for building on this record. Both the President and his OEO Director have indicated their determination to do so.

The administration bill provided for a 2-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act, without amendments, with an authorization of \$2.048 billion for the current year. The Committee on Education and Labor has reported that bill, with some amendments. The committee amendments add new provisions which would emphasize and strengthen Headstart and Follow Through, Operation Mainstream and New Careers, and the emergency food and medical services program. There are also three relatively minor amendments of a clarifying nature.

Under the committee amendments, Operation Mainstream and New Careers are removed from title I-B and given special, separate status in a new part E of title I. In addition, the committee specifically earmarked \$110 million for these two programs. This represents an increase of \$54.7 million over the administration request.

The New Careers program, which is expected to receive above \$50 million of the \$110 million under this new part, is designed to provide jobs for poor people in a manner that gives them an opportunity to advance and make careers in public service employment. It has had demonstrated success in helping poor people—many of them former welfare clients—to achieve economic self-sufficiency. We believe that experience under the program warrants its expansion.

Operation Mainstream is a program to provide work experience for chronically unemployed poor adults who have no reasonable prospects for other full-time employment and who are unable to secure employment or training assistance in other programs. It enables enrollees to obtain meaningful employment in socially useful projects, and experience shows that it is an excellent

means for restoring self-respect. More than a third of the enrollees have found regular jobs as a result of the skills gained while working in the program, and this in spite of the fact that the program is designed for those older persons with very poor employment prospects. Again, we believe that expansion is warranted.

The committee's amendments also add \$188.3 million to the administration request for Headstart and Follow Through programs. It is expected that \$126 million of this addition would be used for Headstart, and the remaining \$62 million for Follow Through.

The administration is committed to converting some of the summer Headstart programs to full-year programs, but the administration budget does not provide additional funds for this purpose. The result is that the administration proposes to serve 184,000 fewer children in the current fiscal year than the number served in fiscal 1969. The additional funds provided by the committee will not fully compensate for the additional cost of converting to a full-year program, but they will reduce the impact on the number of children who can be served. The number of children now served by the program is only a small fraction of the number who could profitably be enrolled.

Evaluation of the Headstart program suggests, however, that much of its benefit may be lost if there is not adequate followup in the early years of elementary education. With this in mind, the committee proposes to double the administration's budget for the Follow Through program.

The third major committee amendment adds a new title X to the Economic Opportunity Act, authorizing programs to eliminate hunger and malnutrition, as a substitute for the present emergency food and medical services program.

The committee bill adds \$62 million to the \$30 million which the administration has budgeted for emergency food and medical services. We are told that the Congress will not have an opportunity to act this year on the administration's proposals for reform of the food stamp system. In the absence of an opportunity to improve the operation of the food programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, we believe it is particularly important to make adequate funds available under the flexible authority contained in the Economic Opportunity Act.

The bill as reported by the committee does not make structural changes in the way that economic opportunity programs are administered. It is a bill that provides essentially for continuity of the legislative authority under which economic opportunity programs are carried out. That does not mean, however, that we do not anticipate important changes in the way these programs are administered. It means only that the majority of the committee believes that the deficiencies in the poverty program have not been caused by the absence of an adequate statutory base. We agree with the administration that needed changes

can be brought about under existing law. Moreover, we fear that substantial changes in the structure of these programs would be disruptive, and would not be conducive to an orderly program of improving their administration.

I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, that 2 years ago, in December 1967, we did make very substantial changes in the structure of these programs. The major titles of the Economic Opportunity Act were completely rewritten at that time. We provided for a substantial expansion of work and training programs to include services for the adult poor, and we introduced the concept of a community work and training program under the sponsorship of a single local agency. We provided for a complete restructuring of community action agencies, and for increased roles for State and local governments.

We also provided for better evaluation of Economic Opportunity Act programs. We wrote a good bill in 1967, and it has proved its effectiveness.

If the contemplated reforms which we wrote into the Economic Opportunity Act in 1967 have not been fully implemented, there is no indication that we need more law.

We simply need more administration. And our former colleague, Mr. Rumsfeld, has committed himself to the task of making the present legislation work. It is my belief that we owe him the opportunity to fulfill the commitment.

During hearings on the OEO legislation last spring, Mr. James Martin, representing the National Governors' Conference, testified that what was needed was not new legislation, but adequate implementation of existing legislation.

Let me quote briefly from Mr. Martin's testimony, which appears on page 1379, volume 2, of the hearings on the anti-poverty legislation:

The recommendations of the States concerning the OEO programs are all positive. No State even suggests that the programs be abandoned, none suggests that the States "take over" the program and those States that desire to administer the program agree that Federal guidelines to protect the interests and participation of the poor, State financial assistance, and State planning and coordination machinery are prerequisites to State administration.

Another major criticism that has been made has been of the failure to provide for solid, unbiased evaluation of program results. We provided the statutory basis for such evaluation in the 1967 amendments, but the results are so far disappointing. Director Rumsfeld has left no room for doubt about his commitment to honest, searching, objective evaluations. Existing law provides all the authority that is needed. Let us give him the opportunity.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there is in this body an abiding concern that some of the poverty programs may be contributing to the divisive tendencies in our society rather than those that tend to unite us. For all the good that this program has done—and it unquestionably has done a great deal of good—this is a legitimate matter of concern. Once again, however, it is not the result of lack

of adequate statutory authority. The Director has asked for no additional powers and needs no additional powers to deal with this problem. He has recognized the problem, and he has expressed his commitment to deal with it—to make this a program that builds bridges rather than one that alienates the poor from the rest of society. I should hope that my colleagues on the other side would find it in problem, and he has expressed his commitment by this administration could be taken at face value. Let us give him the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago we set out upon a dynamic and fundamentally different approach to solving the problems of the poor in this country. It was different because we dared to say: "Let us let the poor people, the local communities, decide what they need to get out of poverty. And then let's use the resources of the Nation to help them."

That action was necessary because existing social and governmental agencies had not done the job previously. The agencies of the Federal Government had not done it, although the Federal programs had helped immeasurably. Certainly the States had not done anything of spectacular success in that field. The local communities and the poor themselves had not done it, because no one had ever before enlisted them in an overall, coordinated national policy effort.

It was a courageous action on the part of the Congress and on the incumbent administration 5 years ago. Although some progress has been achieved, much work remains to be done.

The administration has indicated that it has the courage to carry on the effort. I believe the same kind of courage resides in this House.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I am a little confused. I hope the gentleman can clarify a situation I am particularly and directly interested in, because I also would like to get clarification from the other side.

I am responsible for a program known as the family emergency loan program, which was inaugurated 4 years ago. It has been funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and is in operation now and has proved highly successful.

I shall give the gentleman an idea, for a second, of what it has done.

I got a letter from a nurse in San Antonio, Tex., who could get a job in a hospital if she had \$40 to buy a pair of space shoes. She went to the office of the family emergency loan program, borrowed \$40, bought a pair of space shoes, got the job, and paid the money back.

I should like to know whether or not this program of which I speak—and there are other instances of similar loans made—will of necessity be referred to any State agency or any Governor before it can be continued or funded.

Mr. PERKINS. It certainly will. If there is a State plan submitted, your program may never see the light of day again. If the State plan does not incorporate your program, it will not be funded.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time yielded by the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. As one member of the minority I would like to thank the chairman for supporting the position of the President of the United States, at least as initially submitted. As the chairman will recall, the President on four occasions said that he was for a straight 2-year extension, without crippling amendments.

Mr. PERKINS. That is right.

Mr. REID of New York. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity has informed the President that the substitute is a crippling amendment. I see no difference between the second substitute and the first substitute in substance. The Director of Office of Economic Opportunity is not for the first or second substitute.

I thank the chairman for his support of the President.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York for his remarks. I am hopeful that later this afternoon we will have support for the President of the United States and the Director of Office of Economic Opportunity.

I wish to say again that we conducted the most comprehensive hearings that have ever been conducted on the poverty program. Every Member of Congress who wanted to bring witnesses before the committee had that opportunity up until we closed the hearings on June 9.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Briefly.

Mr. SCHERLE. Will my chairman tell me in regard to those five volumes of hearings as to who the parties were that testified?

Mr. PERKINS. All right. I invite the Members of this House to look through the index of the five volumes of hearings. That will reveal that the committee heard testimony from a great variety of witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. As I have said, the entire thrust of the substitute is to increase the involvement of the Governors in all antipoverty program. The new authority can only be interpreted as further limiting the prerogatives of local communities.

That is what it does. Now listen to this.

Without regard to the State plan, the Director may fund special emphasis programs out of the one-fourth reservation of title II funds. Or, if the Direc-

tor finds that the failure to fund would result in a substantial disruption in the State to eliminate poverty, he may independently fund.

Now to me this particular provision indicates the greatest fallacy in the proposal. The Director may fund independently programs which are considered at the Federal level to have special significance. He may fund independently programs which have implications for the overall effort in the State to eliminate poverty.

But the Director may not independently fund individual community locally conceived and locally designed programs.

Let me ask the gentleman from Minnesota whether under this language there is any opting out provision so that a program of a local community may be independently funded?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. The provision of the substitute permits the State to assume administrative responsibility presently held in the regional offices. Since there is no opting out from the regional office, there would be no opting out from that administrative responsibility handled by the State which would only go to him if he asked for a director to approve.

So as far as the opting out in the present act, it only occurs when the State decides to become a community action agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Under existing law the Governor has a veto over all community action programs.

Under the substitute however when there is a State plan it may wipe out programs at the local level. Where there is a State plan which nothing down does not provide for neighborhood service centers there will be no funds for such centers. The State will control the program.

Mr. QUIE. The problem you raise is a problem that existed in the 1967 amendments that you supported which permits under the act, a State to become a community action agency. We do not give them additional authority.

Mr. PERKINS. We provided an opting-out provision in 1965.

Mr. QUIE. No.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; we did.

Mr. QUIE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. You gave them an opting-out provision and that opting-out provision still exists. If a State chooses to be a community action program or agency, it is not removed.

The OEO program in a State may become a CAP agency. That is why none did. Some wanted to be and the OEO provided that they can do it.

We have not changed that language in the 1967 act that you supported, but rather they permitted the States that would desire to assume administrative

responsibility that presently resides in the regional offices.

That is the extent to which that part of the substitute that you referred to applies.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me answer by stating to my distinguished colleague that the substitute supersedes and it usurps the prerogatives of the local communities. Under the 67 amendments, they had the authority to opt out and make their applications even though the State had elected to become a CAP.

Any local community that so desired—we stressed local control—had the right to opt out. But that has been effectively precluded if a State plan is submitted. We have completely destroyed the opting-out provision. The local communities are placed at the mercy—lock, stock, and barrel—of the Governors of the States.

Now you may say there is one exception—special emphasis—yes. And another exception is where the Director finds a disruption in the overall State effort to eliminate poverty.

Again you play into the hands of the State. Remember also that the State disburses the money and many local communities may be forced to abandon programs which they think have a high priority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I wonder if the chairman could give us one single instance in the entire United States where any city or county or any local community action agency opted the power.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague, as she knows, there is no State that is now serving as a community action agency. According to the study which the representatives of the Governors presented to the committee, the States do not want to serve as community action agencies. We are trying to force something onto them. The right of the State to be a CAP has been in the law since 1967, as has been the Hawkins amendment that permitted local communities or local community action agencies to opt out in the event a State did take over.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. When you admit that no single community action agency in the entire United States during the last 2 years the law has been in effect has ever opted out, then you would also agree, would you not, that OEO acted outside the law when they issued a regulation that they would not recognize a State as a community action agency even though the 1967 law said that they could?

Mr. PERKINS. I will not agree that they have violated the law. I think the great majority of States in the country do not want to destroy local initiative, because they realize it would be a great mistake.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Is it not correct that we have been informed that since the adoption of the Hawkins amendment in 1967, in several States where they considered establishing a State plan they were informed in no uncertain terms that the major cities in those States would opt out of the program, and they would have opted out?

Mr. PERKINS. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Also Arizona and some other States. In fact, the threat to opt out was what caused the State to realize that if they opted out, there would be no program for them to administer.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I am not too keen about turning the program over to the Governor of my State, but I would rather deal with him, if I had to, than I would some arrogant bureaucrat in Chicago who is running the program now, who tells me it is none of my business, to keep my nose out of it, that he is running it. He was never elected by anybody. He is responsible to nobody. But he is telling the people in my constituency what they have got to do and what they cannot do. If I have to choose between the Governor and this fellow, I will take the devil I know, rather than the devil I do not know.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Ohio that mistakes of that type have been made over the country. There is no question about it.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the Members in this Chamber will not because of the overly publicized instances of abuse, turn their backs on the progress that has been made under this program. Clearly we are eliminating a lot of the waste in the program. I hope that the Members will not say, "We are going to turn the clock back." Forward is the direction we need to go.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Under the proposed bill, will the devil in Chicago be eliminated, or would we just substitute another devil?

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, because I desire to point out to the Members that when the chairman says all the manpower programs under title I will have to go to the Governor for renewal, I should point out that is exactly what happens now under section 242. There is a necessity of the Governor's veto, and as far as the Job Corps is concerned, there are no overrides on the part of the Director.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, we might turn back to the discussion of last Wednesday, December 3, when the gen-

tleman from Minnesota, the gentlewoman from Oregon, the gentleman speaking, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) took an hour each on special orders.

Members will find all that discussion in the RECORD for December 3. I do not see any reason, Mr. Chairman, for being repetitious today and going into all that which was stated at that time. If there are those of the committee who would like to refresh their memories, they can refer to the December 3 RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it behooves each and every one of us not to take his eyes off what was the original purpose of the poverty bill. I see present many members of the committee who were active in that discussion a little over 5 years ago.

At that time there were many of us who were somewhat doubtful as to whether \$1 billion plus should be vested in a program without any plan as to how the money would be spent or what should be done to break the pockets of poverty in this country.

In my own personal opinion at that time—and it is still my opinion—the only way we are really going to break the pockets of poverty in the United States was to get a man a job.

Five years ago, as this program was started, it was supposed to be job oriented. That was the purpose, to help a man in poverty, unemployed, get a job.

It was argued on this floor at that time that the Job Corps was the proper way to do this. We experimented with the Job Corps for over 4 years. We found, in the final analysis, that it was not too practical to transfer young men and women from one section of the country to another in an effort to teach them something they could learn close to home.

We tried to make amendments to that.

Then in 1967, as Members will recall, there was considerable discussion as to what should be done with the Job Corps and also Headstart. The existing act was so drawn that by Executive order the Administrator could make great changes in the operation of the program.

During the course of the 1966 and 1968 campaigns a vast majority of the Members of the House, both Democrat and Republican, criticized the operation of the program.

In fact, on my side of the aisle we had a detailed publication as to just what had gone wrong with the war on poverty. And much of this criticism was aimed at what was not done, which in my judgment was the intent of the Congress after the 1967 amendments.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from Kentucky has just taken 44 minutes, and I enjoyed the discussion, because there have been so many differing opinions offered on this program. He stated the President's position and stated that he was supporting the President, and that the substitute was going to give the States complete authority over this program; and he implied by innuendo that he did not have confidence in the State governments or in the local governments.

But, Mr. Chairman, I know my friend will recall that he has reversed his po-

sition from 2 years ago, because in the debate found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 24, page 32637, this is what my able chairman said:

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely vital to the success of community action that duly-elected local officials play a leading role in the local programs. Such a role will be guaranteed under the provisions of the committee bill this amendment would delete.

And I see the charming gentlewoman from Oregon smiling as she should be.

Further reading the quote:

We must reject this attempt to deny local and State officials their appropriate role in the war on poverty—

That is a very noble statement. That is exactly what we thought we were doing in 1967. But I can assure you by legislative action that will be done in the substitute bill which I hope will be adopted later this afternoon—

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Of course I yield to the gentleman who has changed his opinion.

Mr. PERKINS. First, let me state that I was a supporter from the beginning to the end of the Green amendment. In many sections of the country it has just commenced to go into effect. Your own Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity states he does not need any additional legislation to achieve better coordination with the States. We all believe in coordination, but we do not believe in letting States take over the functions and the innovative programs which properly belong at the local level. That was not contemplated in the Green amendment in 1967.

I am now taking the same position I took in 1967 in supporting the Hawkins amendment to permit any local government or community action agency to opt out of the State plan if the State did set up a State CAP. I want to clarify the record. Whether the mistake was made by the gentleman today or whether it was made when it was put in the RECORD, my stand is perfectly clear and if you will read the whole statement the gentleman cannot misunderstand it.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman from Ohio has not misunderstood it. However, I shall be glad to accommodate the chairman, because it gets better:

We must get the local governments more involved in this program. If we are going to have a constructive program and a program that is going to extend and survive the next 5 years and 10 years to serve the people in the ghettos and rural areas. To do so we must get the local governments involved more so than they have been in the past, for somewhere along the line we are going to have too much trouble in the enactment of this program in the future.

That is the position in which we find ourselves today.

Mr. PERKINS. That is a true statement and I stand by that statement.

Mr. AYRES. Now, you get a little better:

In the language worked out in the committee for Sections 210 and 211 we simply provide that a Community Action agency shall be a State municipality or a local subdivision of that State or they may, if they wish, designate a private nonprofit agency or some other public agency to serve as the ac-

tion agency. But in all instances we are going to help the poor.

I commend the gentleman on his sound stand and I am glad to inform him that the Council of State Governments in a special letter just released also agrees with him on his position in 1967.

This is what the Council of State Governments on December 5, 1969, had to say regarding poverty amendments:

Debate has begun in the House on measures to extend the authorization for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Two measures are before the House: HR 12321, Committee on Education and Labor version for a simple two-year extension; and a bi-partisan substitute to provide states the *option* of greater participation in administering their poverty programs. Voting is expected to begin before December 12.

And, that is true. This is not a Republican position or a Democratic position. This is a position of those who felt changes had to be made if we were going to help the poor, and as the letter states:

A bi-partisan group of Congressmen, led by Reps. Ayres (Ohio), Green (Oregon), Quie (Minn.) and Glaimo (Conn.) have introduced the Ayres substitute bill. (copy attached) It would give states the opportunity to establish a broadly-representative State Economic Opportunity Council. If the Director of OEO approves the Council, it could develop a long range coordinated anti-poverty program in the state. This agency's program would also be subject to approval by the OEO Director. Such state involvement would be completely optional with the individual states.

S. 3016, the Senate companion of the House Committee version would give Governors a line item veto over legal services programs in their states. There is no similar provision in the Ayres substitute.

Hasty, early observations on the Ayres substitute has led to considerable misunderstanding of its aims. A staff analysis is attached, describing the measure and indicating that it would not violate the objectives of the OEO program, but rather generally would move toward the positive partnership role for state and local government in the anti-poverty program that has been sought by state officials for several years.

Your views on the specific proposals in the Ayres substitute would be very helpful to your congressional delegation as it considers this measure. Because voting will begin very shortly, your immediate response is urgently requested. A copy to this office would be appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, when we go back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent for permission to insert the staff analysis on the OEO substitute bill.

The material referred to follows:

STAFF ANALYSIS OF OEO SUBSTITUTE BILL

The substitute bill for the Committee-reported OEO authorization will make the following major changes in the existing Economic Opportunity Act:

(1) *The State Economic Opportunity Offices would be strengthened in the following ways:*

(A) The Director of OEO is required to assist these offices in carrying out their role under the Act;

(B) All applications for community action programs and VISTA programs in a State would first go to the State Office for review and recommendations;

(C) If a State Office disapproved of an application the Director could fund it only upon his finding that the failure to conduct the project would seriously weaken the

overall program plan of a community action agency. (In the existing law, the Director may override a Governor's veto upon the finding merely that the proposed project is consistent with the Act).

(D) The State Office would be given a more effective role in assisting local community action programs, in coordinating such programs in the State, and of auditing and program evaluation.

(2) *It provides for a positive, affirmative role for the State through the implementation of a "State Developmental and Coordination Program" designed to focus all the resources of State government upon finding solutions to problems of poverty. The key elements of this program are as follows:*

(A) Any State wishing to participate would establish a State Economic Opportunity Council, broadly representative of the State and of the anti-poverty resources and agencies, which would identify the causes of poverty and develop a long-range plan for overcoming problems of poverty in the State, and would approve a State Developmental and Coordination Program consistent with such plan;

(B) The State Economic Opportunity Office would submit this Program to the Director of OEO for his approval;

(C) Upon approval of the Program by the Director, the State Office would become responsible for approving community action and VISTA programs within the State, for coordination of all programs relating to poverty and the needs of the poor, for providing technical assistance to local community action agencies, for assuring that an adequate system of fund accounting is carried out, and for relating anti-poverty programs to the long-range plan of the State Economic Opportunity Council;

(D) The Director of OEO would retain authority to assure that all programs conducted conform to the Act, that all the provisions of the State program are carried out, that funds are fairly distributed within each State according to criteria approved by the Director, and to terminate any State program which fails to meet the requirements of the Act.

(3) *Changes would be made in a number of provisions of the existing Act to assure a more orderly and effective administrative procedure, to conform practices to the intent of Congress, as expressed in previous legislation, and to address situations of poverty ignored under existing programs. Chief among these changes are:*

(A) The role of elected public officials in community action boards would be clarified and strengthened to conform with the intent of the 1967 amendments to the Act;

(B) New programs would be authorized to (i) combat the disease of alcoholism, (ii) assist families of members of the Armed Forces when, due to exceptional circumstances, they live in poverty, and (iii) assist persons over 65 years of age who must live on an income below the poverty level;

(C) Prohibitions on political activity and participation in riots by paid poverty workers would be tightened up, and a new prohibition against nepotism would be added to the Act;

(D) Program evaluation at the Federal level would be greatly strengthened through a continuing role for the Comptroller General;

(E) Situations involving conflicts of interest on the part of former employees of OEO would be strictly regulated;

(F) VISTA would be restructured so that the recruiting, selection, training, and assignment of "volunteers" would be done by State and local agencies under grants from the Director;

(G) VISTA personnel acting as attorneys would do so as a part of the legal Services programs; and

(H) The Legal Services program would be

encouraged to be more responsible through a provision that would permit a court to award legal fees and costs to the winner of a lawsuit initiated by the Legal Services program.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I note that our distinguished colleague has laid great stress on the opting out provisions that were written into the law for a State plan, in 1967.

Now, under your substitute, where a State plan is submitted to the Director, and it is an overall State plan, is there any opting out provision for any local community, or local community action agency?

Mr. AYRES. I will say to the gentleman that under the substitute we are going along with what the Council of State Governments asked for before and we are giving the Administrator legislative authority, giving him the tools, the tools that he had been given under the 1967 amendments that they did not choose to use.

I would like to say to the chairman that insofar as trying to assume that these proposals that are being offered in the substitute today have something wrong with them—that they are not the same or identically the same as was in the December 3 proposed—

Mr. PERKINS. That is right.

Mr. AYRES. When the gentleman decided that the Congress should not work its will that week.

Let me read to the chairman—

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, let me ask one further question—

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further at this point. I want to finish my statement.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important for the Committee to realize that it was through the suggestion of the President of the United States when he stated, in answer to a question:

I hope he is—

Meaning his Administrator—

able to work out with the leadership in the House—

And I might say that our minority leadership at that moment, of course, all of the leadership had signed the substitute on our side, and the President was aware of that, and he said:

I hope he is able to work out with the leadership in the House, most of whom are Republicans in this instance who want the changes, and some Democrats, and be able to work out some kind of accommodation with them. But, of course, I support my Director that I have appointed.

The President certainly should support the Director whom he has appointed.

After his statement at his press conference, I immediately called together the members of the minority of our committee, and there was a difference of opinion—and they will speak later this afternoon—and we were able to come to an agreement on accommodations that the President had asked for. And that is what we are offering here today, the substitute bill with the accommodations that have been arrived at by the minority

members of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we have a substitute that is long overdue; that we have a substitute that gives the Administrator the tools that he needs to work with to truly help the poor. I feel at the present time that he will do a good job, because he is a fine gentleman and he is an able gentleman, but I do not believe that the Administrator realized, any more than I would have realized, that in taking that job that he had a built-in constituency that would be very, very difficult to work with.

We are giving him the tools to change the program, to correct the program, and also change some of the constituency.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me briefly at that point?

Mr. AYRES. I have consumed all of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 18 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) 15 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I have continuously supported the OEO programs and I am not one who favors doing away with the OEO offices or programs.

But if the administration of the OEO programs is not improved, and if abuses are not corrected, then I may well join those in 1971 who feel we have to take another course.

May I also say to the friends of the OEO programs that the best insurance in the world for the continuation of the OEO in 1971 and in 1972 and 1973 is the correction of abuses that now exist.

The bill which was brought out by the committee provided for a straight 2-year extension; without one single change in the law, in terms of administration, in terms of structure, in terms of the accountability of funds, in terms of abuses, in terms of violence and the training of revolutionaries, in terms of political activities—in all of these areas—not a single change.

The only change that was made was one which added additional funds to the administration request.

It seems to me that is not the way we are going to have a continuation of a healthy war on poverty in this country.

The chairman has made some statements. He has stated that Jim Martin—representing the Governors' conference—was opposed to this substitute and opposed to any legislative changes.

The distinguished ranking Member on the Republican side read a statement that was published by Jim Martin, giving his endorsement to the substitute. Moreover, let me insert just a few excerpts from Mr. Martin on behalf of the National Governors' Conference. The complaints made certainly indicate that strengthening legislation from this Congress is in order:

Past experience reveals that the State Economic Opportunity Office (SEOO) has had little authority, little administrative control and no meaningful role in the financing and evaluation of local projects. The Governor's

veto, although better than total bypassing, is a negative role. The Governors much prefer a positive partnership role to help develop statewide programs, but with appropriate administrative authority. If the State's role is not expanded in a positive manner, then the Governor's veto should be extended to all sections of the act.

The States have had no say-so in the allocation of OEO funds within the State because OEO has preferred a project-by-project approach rather than a coordinated state program based on Federal guidelines and appropriate measures of need.

The States have made specific recommendations for more State participation in the planning, coordination and administration of the OEO programs. Most, if not all, of these expanded State responsibilities are now authorized in the OEO act. There are over 15 specific sections of the act that provide for a State role. The states feel that OEO personnel have never encouraged the implementation of these sections of the act.

Several states suggested that OEO programs become the social development arm of State designated multijurisdictional regional planning agencies.

The States seek a greater role with the Federal Government in administration of OEO. More funds should be allocated to the State agency for program development, especially for coordination, training, technical assistance, and special services such as health, legal aid, manpower development, housing and migrant programs.

The State should participate in the allocation and approval of funds distributed within the State. OEO should use State and local personnel to administer the program rather than building up OEO employees in the regional and field offices.

The recommendations of the States concerning the OEO programs are all positive. No state even suggests that the programs be abandoned, none suggests that the States "take over" the program and those States that desire to administer the program agree that Federal guidelines to protect the interests and participation of the poor, State financial assistance, and State planning and coordination machinery are prerequisites to State administration.

The testimony and the hearings were very enlightening in terms of the recommendations that the Governors' conference itself made for changes in the programs.

May I say in all good humor to my chairman, that I am intrigued by the argument that we must not make any changes in the program because the President and the Director of the OEO have recommended that none be made.

I am intrigued because the chairman will recall 2 years ago when he sat in my office, when he knew he did not have the votes on the floor of the House, and with other Members who are in this Chamber today—that he and I and others worked out amendments that were opposed by the President and by the Director of the OEO at that time.

So it is interesting that this is an argument against the substitute at this moment.

The chairman also said the substitute bill would completely destroy local community action agencies. After the 1967 amendments were passed which provided that a State or political subdivision of a State can be designated as a community action agency, the first thing OEO did, and the record will show it, was to say that they would not designate a State. Examples may be cited in the States of Arizona and Arkansas. There

were nine States that were interested in being designated as CAP agencies.

The OEO in effect, said, "We do not care about the law. We have decided we will not designate a State. We will give preference to cities."

If the OEO had followed the law in 1967, 1968, 1969—then some of the reasons for this substitute would not be so urgent today.

The second thing they did was to say that they would not designate any city with a population under 250,000 people. Most of the cities in the United States are under 250,000 in population. By regulation—they rewrote the law. Certainly there was no population figure set when Congress passed that bill by majority vote.

That destroyed the possibility of any local control in most of the cities of the country. How could you be more effective in destroying off local control of the program? And today we hear shouted over and over: "If you give the State the right and opportunity to coordinate programs and help develop plans, all local control will be destroyed."

The third thing OEO said was they would not designate a county with a population of under 50,000 people—even though the law says:

A state or a political subdivision of a state can be designated as a Community Action Agency.

It has also been said by the chairman, and I think the record should be clear on this, that the substitute bill would be disastrous because every manpower program would go under a State plan.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any virtue in not touching a single manpower program, then I heartily recommend the substitute bill because the fact is the substitute bill does not touch title 1 (b) of the OEO program and it does not touch the manpower training on job programs. I challenge you. Look at the bill. See for yourself.

But the committee bill indeed does touch upon job training programs—Mainstream—and simply provides additional funds for it even though every member of the committee knows that all the manpower training programs are being reviewed with the hope of reorganizing and coordinating under the Department of Labor.

I also hope when the bill is being considered under the 5-minute rule that the question asked by the gentleman from New York could be clarified. I do not want to take the time now, but the instances that were cited are not touched by the substitute bill. There is absolutely no change.

Then it has also been said that if we have a State plan, it really would be sad for the cities and these local districts because people would have to go hundreds of miles to the State capital to get their plans approved.

The fact is that right now my city of Portland, Oreg., has to go 750 miles to San Francisco to see if they can get it approved. Whereas, if the substitute bill were in effect, they would only have to go 50 miles to the State capital.

The gentleman from Ohio was absolutely right. People today, who complain against the possibility of a State veto,

are the very ones who defend, and who want the regional offices to have the absolute veto power and absolute control over the program. Why an appointed czar in a regional office is to have our unlimited love and trust and the Governors elected by a majority vote are to be slandered is beyond my comprehension. But today—the way the law is being administered officials in every city and every town must go with hat in hand to the regional offices. If the appointed official at the regional office does not like it, they can reject it, and they do not base their decision on the law. We have had them come to Portland from the regional office. As I said the other day, we had 50 problems before the regional czar came into Portland. But by the time he left we had 100 problems.

This kind of person comes in and does not even cite the law. He says, I "feel" that you really should do it in some other way. His word becomes law and local control is absolutely destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, there have been lots of complaints about OEO. Every single Member in this Chamber knows them—the high administrative costs, the poverty specialists that are taking the funds that were meant for the poor, the corruption that has occurred in the program, the freewheeling activities of the VISTA people in place after place. Many colleagues on my side of the aisle have complained about the way the OEO has operated. I do not know how many Members on the Democratic side of the aisle have come to me in the course of the last 2 years and complained about the administration of the CAP program. Many of you have pleaded: "Can't something be done?"

It has been argued that we have a new Director; therefore we should give him a chance and we should not change the law. I pay my respects to Mr. Rumsfeld. I think he has an extremely difficult job and I wish him well. I hope he is able to correct the wrongs in the program. But a few years ago a gentleman who was the majority leader in the Senate and who later became President of the United States—and I refer to President Johnson—said when he was in the Senate:

Legislation should not be examined in the light of benefits it will convey if properly administered but by wrongs it would cause if improperly administered.

I suggest to my friends that the responsibility of this House is to draft legislation not in the light of what would happen if it is properly administered but in the light of what has happened during the last 5 years when it has been improperly administered.

I suggested that few would argue that there have not been more scandals, more waste of money in this program than any other, and the committee, in spite of all the wrongs, voted out this 2-year extension with no changes. That is the reason why we have the bipartisan substitute bill. It was not the intention, as I understood this legislation in its original form—and I was on the committee at that time—to create shadow governments, autonomous units with the luxury of millions to spend and none of the

responsibility of raising the money. It was not the original intent of this legislation to legislate a revolution in American politics by establishing another level of government not subject to the elective process.

May I quote one of the most liberal leaders in the OEO program, Mitchell Sveridoff of New York. In November 1967 he said—and he had been a great defender of OEO—

It is a hell of a way to run a public program. It's unhealthy. What it does is to inform people that the way to get some money is to have a riot or threaten one.

Mr. Chairman, in 1967, when the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, and I, with other Members who are in this body, most of them not on the committee, when we developed those amendments, the opponents—and the chairman will remember this very well and every single person who is here today and who was here in 1967 remembers the argument—the opponents of any change in OEO at that time tried to defeat the amendment to title II, the amendment I offered, by crying, "This is a take-over by city hall. Do not trust city hall." Do you remember those arguments? "Do not trust city hall."

This year they are crying, "Do not trust Governors. Do not allow the Governor to take over a program. Do not allow the Governor to have any say in coordinating these multitudinous programs at the State level.

I can only say what a tragedy it will be if the war on poverty continues to be perverted to an attack on local government or State government as though they were the cause or even held the cure for the problem. But consistently the opponents of any change are willing to place absolute veto power, in the appointed officials at the regional office.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, by its actions against elected officials in our cities and States and by its creation of a network of regional czars not accountable to the votes of any body politic, has seriously damaged the perfecting nature of our own democracy. OEO has had its own scandals, OEO has had frauds, OEO has had waste and misbehavior, but it has not been held accountable for them. The Office of Economic Opportunity has moved against elected State governments on two major fronts, first the political and then the economic. In section 231 of the Economic Opportunity Act the Director of OEO is authorized to provide technical assistance to the States so that they can help the local community action agencies, but in the entire history of this Act the OEO has only given \$36 million to all 50 States for technical assistance, even though the law directs them to do so. But to private corporations, the poverty specialists, the people who are looting the funds that were meant for the poor—to those people they have given \$103 million in technical assistance alone.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the record clearly shows that for evaluation programs \$31 million has been spent, and for support contracts over a half billion dollars has been spent. I am not includ-

ing operational expenses such as Job Corps.

Worst of all, the Office of Economic Opportunity has also continued the same cry we have heard by the opponents of change, the ones who will benefit most by the status quo. The OEO itself and the OEO employees are saying, "You cannot trust the State government. The elected officials cannot be trusted. The State cannot be trusted." They repeat this over and over to their constituents.

"But, somehow, these regional, appointed people are to be trusted." How interesting.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be very, very sad if the Members of this Congress, every one of us elected by popular vote, were to join this hue and cry that somehow we are not to trust elected officials, that somehow this year we are not to trust Governors, that somehow in 1967 we were not to trust city hall.

May I, Mr. Chairman, quote the very distinguished Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK). I thought he made an eloquent statement in 1967 when the bill was before us, and he was supporting the bill which the chairman and I both supported, which allowed a State to become a CAA.

The distinguished Speaker said:

I might say that only the other day Governor Volpe, who is personal friend of mine and whom I like very much—I wish he were a Democrat—issued a proclamation. I call this to the attention of all the Members of the House.

Without reading it in full, the Speaker quoted Governor Volpe as follows:

Government has a basic responsibility for the economic well-being of all citizens in this State and Nation, and the State has the unique potential to effect necessary changes through cooperation with and coordination and utilization of the resources of the Federal and local governments as well as the private sector.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. May I have 5 additional minutes?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the distinguished gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield time to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. PERKINS. I say this in all sincerity. I have made arrangements to try to borrow some time from our minority friends, because we have overpromised our time.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Would it be possible that some of these militant organizations could have gotten OEO funds?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I do not believe there is any doubt about it.

The record is clear that they financed the Blackstone Rangers in Chicago.

The gentleman from Cleveland complained last year, I believe, there was financing of a Black Panther group in Cleveland, and then following there was a shootout.

I believe there are many examples.

Mr. Chairman, if I may turn to one other point, today in this debate we are trying to say, "Do not trust the Governors. They will destroy the local unit. You must not have a State plan for OEO."

Mr. Chairman, I just want to list the number of bills that have come out of the House Committee on Education and Labor under the leadership of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, that have State plans.

ESEA, title I; a State plan.

ESEA, title II; a State plan.

Title III; we made a State plan in the amendments of 1967.

The National Defense Education Act; a State plan.

NDEA; a State plan.

The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities; a State plan.

The Higher Education Act, Community Services; a State plan.

The Higher Education Act, Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction; a State plan.

I have three pages listing the bills that came out of this committee in which in every instance we had a State plan.

Why in all these cases do we trust the State government, do we say it would be better to have a State plan, but somehow today, on OEO, we would simply destroy everything if we have a State plan?

At this point let me insert an exact compilation of instances in which legislation designed by the Committee on Education and Labor has provided for State coordinated programs:

FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS WHICH REQUIRE STATE PLANS

Page 18, ESEA of 1965, Title I, Sec. 105.

Page 33, ESEA of 1965, Title II, Sec. 203.

Page 39, ESEA of 1965, Title III, Sec. 304—

A grant under this section may be made to local educational agency either "pursuant to an approved State plan or by the Commissioner for a supplementary educational center or service program or project. . . ."

Page 49, ESEA of 1965, Title V, Sec. 503 (to strengthen State Departments of Education).

Page 92, School Construction in Areas Affected by Federal Activities (81-815, Sec. 6.

Page 115, National Defense Education Act, Title III—Part A—Financial Assistance for strengthening instruction in Science, Foreign Languages, etc., Sec. 303.

Page 120, NDEA, Title V—Guidance, Counseling & Testing, Sec. 503.

Page 129, National Foundation on the Arts & Humanities, Sec. 12.

Page 143, Higher Education Act, Title I—Community Service & Continuing Education Programs, Sec. 105.

Page 214, Higher Education Act, Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction—Title VI, Sec. 603.

Page 239, Higher Education Act, Title I—Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities, Sec. 105.

Page 299, Higher Education Act, Title V—B—Teacher Corps, Sec. 513—for purposes of training and assignment, State education agency must be involved.

Page 304, Higher Education Act, Title V—B—Attracting & Qualifying Teachers to Meet Critical Teacher Shortages, Sec. 520.

Page 309, Higher Education Act, Title V—

D—Improving Training Opportunities for Personnel Serving in Programs of Education Other than Higher Education, Sec. 531—may make contracts or grants with higher ed, institution and State educational agency and local educational agency with approval of State educational agency.

Page 328, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Title I—Part B—State Grants, Sec. 122.

Page 337, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Title I—Part D—Exemplary Programs & Projects, Sec. 142.

Page 339, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Title I—Part E—Residential Vocational Education, Sec. 151—to "State boards, to colleges and universities, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to public educational agencies, organizations or institutions. . . ."

Page 342, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Title I—Part F—Consumer and Home-making Education, Sec. 161.

Page 344, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Title I—Part G—Cooperative Vocational Education Programs, Sec. 173.

Page 346, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Title I—Part H—Work-study Programs for Vocational Ed students, Sec. 181.

Page 348, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Curriculum Development in Vocational & Technical Education, Sec. 191—State agencies must be consulted in making grants or contracts to "colleges or universities, State boards, and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions. . . ."

Page 377, Library Services & Construction Act, Public Library Services, Sec. 101.

Page 380, Library Services & Construction Act, Public Library Construction, Sec. 203.

Page 381, Library Services & Construction Act, Inter-Library Cooperation, Sec. 301.

Page 383, Library Services & Construction Act, Specialized State Library Service, Sec. 401.

Page 426, ESEA Amendments of 1966, Adult Education—Title III—Sec. 304-306.

Page 480, ESEA—Title VI—Handicapped Children, Sec. 603-604.

Page 515, Appalachian Regional Development Act, Statement of Purpose, "The States will be responsible for recommending local and State projects, within their borders, which will receive assistance under this Act."

Now, Members who serve on other committees do not steer away from a State plan.

Let me suggest that in the Omnibus Crime Control Act there is a State plan; the comprehensive health plan program is a State plan; the Water Pollution Control Act is a State plan; land and water conservation fund is a State plan; the Hill-Burton program is a State plan; the highway program is a State plan. And, incidentally, 26 States have created an office of community affairs and every Governor has appointed at least one person in a similar assignment.

Then, Mr. Chairman, in the extracts from the Water Pollution Control Act of 1966, "it is declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibility and rights of the States who have this type of program" and that is, a State plan.

We have State plans in all these programs, and I have never heard the cry on this floor that somehow you must not institute them because you cannot trust the elected Governors of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I think the substitute bill in terms of State coordination is the direction in which we should be moving. I hope we are moving to correct a lot of the abuses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me turn, if I

may, to a couple of other things which I would like to call the attention of the members of the committee.

With reference to technical assistance, I have already referred to the fact that the OEO has refused to give the States more than \$36 million while it has given private corporations \$103 million.

Now, in terms of corporations that have sprung up all over the country, I think it might be interesting to the Members of the House who have received telegrams and letters as a result of the delay last week which was made in order to get this tremendous lobby pressure moving to cite some of the corporations which might have had something to do with the lobbying and with the letters and telegrams which you may have received. For example, I take the operations of Daniel Yankelovich, whose firm received \$1,137,000 to conduct a study. We gave to Litton Industries during the past 5 years \$54 million. A part of this was for Job Corps out a good part was for other purposes—expenses.

We gave to the National Student Association \$444,822, and I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is going to discuss that later on.

We also gave Walt Disney \$150,000, 20th Century Fox \$100,000, another firm \$100,000, and so on.

We have given to Lou Harris for the studies he has made \$495,000. We have given to the National Education Association in contracts \$3,102,000. There is included the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council almost \$1 million, \$998,000; the painters, decorators, and paperhanger organization, \$179,000; the Council of Southern Mountians, \$111,000; the Educational Association \$2.5 million and \$2 million for educational projects.

This is the reason we have an amendment to make some sense out of all the contracts. We have a provision that says that before any final contracts can be entered into they must be filed in the General Accounting Office. Thus I would hope this would bring some orderly procedure to what is now unexplainable.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion there has been a real conflict of interest. There is one Leo Kramer who was employed by OEO on a full-time consultant basis from February 1, 1965, to January 22, 1966, to the rate of \$90 a day. Since then he has organized his own firm, Leo Kramer, Inc. From 1967 to 1969 Mr. Kramer obtained nine OEO contracts totalling nearly \$2 million. Seven of the contracts were out of the VISTA program office where he was formerly employed. Six of the seven contracts were awarded on a sole-source basis without any competition. On the other contract OEO sent out six requests for proposals on April 26, 1968. By the deadline date May 6, 11 days later, two proposals were received, one from Leo Kramer for \$600,664, and one from Policy Management Systems for \$885,934.

However, Policy Management Systems, headed by Gary Price, also a former employee of OEO in the VISTA program, subsequently withdrew its proposal. Then we find that the contract to Leo Kramer for \$600,664 was increased to \$1,014,216 on May 20, which was interestingly

enough, the same date that Policy Management Systems dropped out. It may be of further interest to my colleagues to note that Policy Management Systems received three sole-source contracts during the next 5 weeks that totaled 632,247.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I would say to the gentleman that it would be interesting to this Member, and I believe to other Members, to learn if the gentleman has information as to just what Mr. Leo Kramer Associates did with this money. Not only what they did with it, but what they were supposed to do with it when the contracts were entered into.

Could the gentlewoman inform the House as to that?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I think that one of the most difficult things at the present time is to find out the results of the contracts, and the evaluations. There just simply is no way. I think most of the studies are gathering dust, are not being utilized, or are worthless.

In addition to this, the figures which I have cited do not contain an explanation of the contracts—made within the States—my local CAP's.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, in addition to this may I say that I will place in the RECORD information about contracts awarded to Policy Management Systems, Inc., headed by Gary Price, who was an official of VISTA's Office of Selection and Training at the time Leo Kramer was an Associate Director at that office.

Policy Management Systems has received five OEO contracts totaling \$2,493,857. Of these, three are VISTA contracts and two are CAP contracts. It should be noted that VISTA contract B 89-4417 was initially awarded to Policy Management Systems on April 3, 1968, for the amount of \$300,319. During the period May 7, 1968, to November 7, 1969, the contract was modified nine times increasing the amount by a total of \$1,422,876—from \$300,319 to \$1,723,195.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further:

In response to the question posed by the gentleman from Georgia, I would gather the gentlewoman is saying to the House in a nice sort of way that Leo Kramer Associates did nothing with the money insofar as reaching the poor people that this program is intended to reach?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Well, none of the money went to the poor people. This is true time after time. We have spent millions and millions of dollars that go to the poverty specialists and brand new corporations as well as old who have a good thing going. Of course they do not want us to make any changes. But the money is not reaching the poor.

Mr. Chairman, there are other examples of contracts that have been given to people who were former OEO employees, people who were responsible for the administration of the program, who left the OEO to set up their own private corporations, and then received money to evaluate the programs that they formerly administered.

One of the most interesting is the case of Mr. Leveo Sanchez, OEO's Mid-Atlantic regional director from early in calendar year 1967 to September 6, 1968, at which time he resigned.

In July 1968, Leveo Sanchez formed a corporation named Hispanic-American Community Development Corp. The principal officers of Hispanic, which was a subsidiary of Cole, Sanchez & Associates, are Leveo Sanchez, president; David Trevino, vice president; J. Homer Garza, secretary; and Peter Davis, treasurer. All of Hispanic's officers had prior experience with OEO programs, either as direct OEO employees or as employees of OEO funded community action programs. Mr. Davis was an employee in the Mid-Atlantic region from 1966 until his resignation on September 13, 1968. During Mr. Davis' employment with OEO's Mid-Atlantic regional office, he held the positions of special assistant to the regional director and acting deputy CAP regional administrator. In this latter position, Mr. Davis was responsible for assisting in the development of the first regional CAA evaluation system. Following Mr. Davis' resignation, he was employed by Cole, Sanchez & Associates as project director for two contracts, both of which involved performing evaluation services for CAA's in OEO's Mid-Atlantic regional area.

Mr. Sanchez resigned from OEO, as I said, on September 6, 1968. In July he had formed the Hispanic-American Community Development Corp. He was also a partner in Cole, Sanchez & Associates. Although I do not have the date of incorporation for Cole, Sanchez & Associates, its application to be added to OEO's bidders list is dated October 3, 1968.

Both Cole, Sanchez & Associates and the Hispanic-American Community Development Corp. received OEO contracts for evaluation and technical assistance for planning and developing programs.

These instances are just some of the countless examples, Mr. Chairman, where the money has not gone to the people for whom it was intended.

The purposes of the program have been subverted. If we do not take action on the floor of this House today to correct some of these many, many abuses, I think we will deserve the criticism of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation reported out by the committee, and requested by the President, and oppose any substitute that will be subsequently offered.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include a statement made by a very distinguished

mayor of this country, the most capable municipal administrator in America, Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago, who on December 9, 1969, made the following statement—and this is coming from a man who has, I think all in the House would agree, opposed many of the things that have gone on under OEO; one who has been the supporter of measures to improve the OEO, and who has himself frequently been the victim of many things that the gentlewoman from Oregon has just discussed here in her previous statement. And yet on December 9, the mayor of Chicago said as follows:

The proposed substitute bill, which would for all practical purposes turn the Economic Opportunity Program over to the states would adversely affect the program to help the disadvantaged for many reasons.

And, Mr. Chairman, I hope I can have the attention of the Members of the House because I think this statement by Mayor Daley is very important. This is important to those of you who honestly want to do something about the OEO. Mayor Daley states:

1. For the most part, the OEO programs are concerned with city residents, and the responsibilities and the judgments should be centered where the people live. To move this responsibility to the State Capitol, in many instances hundreds of miles away, where the problems may be remote and where there is no first-hand knowledge, would only cripple the programs. Even in the rural areas the responsibilities of the program should be centered in the community.

2. The substitute bill would defeat the highest priority that has been given to the principle that community groups should have direct access to decisionmaking and which permits their participation in such decisions.

3. The substitute bill would introduce another level of bureaucracy in an area where every attempt is being made to reduce red tape and to centralize action in the communities—

Mr. Chairman, this is very important. It addresses itself to the very things the gentlewoman from Oregon has just talked about—

4. Many of the poverty programs are extensions of city services—health, housing, sanitation and others. The substitute bill would bring outside intervention into regular services of municipalities.

5. The substitute bill envisions a substantial revamping in the administration of the OEO that certainly should have full public hearings and testimony.

Mr. Chairman, I need not apologize to anyone in this Chamber, having been perhaps one of the earliest critics of this program. This House ought to be made aware of the fact that in 1967 practically alone in my committee, I urged major changes in the OEO programs. I was one of those who persuaded the gentlewoman from Oregon to sponsor the 1967 amendments which are known as the Green amendments. I make no apology for my criticism of this program because it has helped strengthen the program. I have been time and again in the forefront in calling attention to the shortcomings of the program.

I have asked the General Accounting Office to make a number of investigations and the gentlewoman has access to the same investigations that I have.

Every Member of this Congress has the right to ask the General Accounting Office for a report and investigation of any program in the OEO now.

But I am concerned about what Mayor Daley said in his point 4 because I think this gets to the very heart of the issue.

Giving this program to the States, it means every single little community and every single city in this country will have to go hat in hand to the Governor to try to get the program going for his community.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, in an earlier colloquy that I had with him last week said that there is, in this bill, an opting out provision for the cities. I would like to say to the gentleman, if I may, and I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), if the gentleman can show me where in this substitute there is an opt-out provision for the cities. The gentleman talks about 210(e) but that provides that if a city opts out it totally and completely abandons its programs. When it opts out under this section, there is no more antipoverty program in your city.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) 1 additional minute, since we have so many other Members who need time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Since I only have 1 additional minute, I honestly will not have the time to yield, but I hope the gentleman will answer this question on his own time.

I submit to the Members of this House that any suggestion that there is an opting out provision for any city in this country under the substitute bill is to torture the truth and make a stranger of the facts. There is no opt out—no matter how they twist it around. You cannot put every single city in your State under the control of the statehouse and then incorporate the city services into the State operation. As Mayor Daley said in his point 4, many of the poverty programs are an extension of city services such as health, housing, sanitation and otherwise, and if the State takes over the program, the State must pay for those services now being paid for on the cities from their own resources. Nobody has told us here what this will cost the States or the Federal Government.

If a State has to carry on these programs all within its resources, the gentlewoman has carefully avoided telling us how much it would cost. They have kept you completely in the dark on this program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe we should keep in mind that President Nixon and his OEO Director, Donald Rumsfeld, have both asked a straight continuance for 2 years.

I know Mr. Rumsfeld and I believe we should give him an opportunity to restructure the program. I'm willing to take my chances on Don Rumsfeld to make this war on poverty work.

I hope the substitute will be defeated. A vote for the substitute is a vote of no

confidence in President Nixon and his OEO Director Don Rumsfeld.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), and if the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID) will yield to me, I will answer the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REID) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois would look at his complication on page 549 which is section 210(e)—there is provision for opting out:

No political subdivision of a State shall be included in the community action program of a community action agency designated under section 210(a)—

Which is the provision for a State to become a community action agency—

if the elected or duly appointed governing officials of such political subdivision do not wish to be so included.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If what the gentleman has said is correct, then how do you reconcile the fact that in your substitute bill—and you persuade all the Membership, and the gentledady just gave a big speech over here—how do you propose you are going to clean up this program, putting it in the States, if you say there is a continuing opt-out provision? How would you explain that?

Mr. QUIE. The opt out stands to be used if the State chooses to become a community action agency. I said that on December 3d. I say it now. That is in the law. The substitute provides that the State, if the provisions are acceptable to the Director, can assume many responsibilities presently assumed by the regional office. Since no State or local community can opt out of the regional office, naturally you will not be able to opt out of the State office.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, I believe, would not undertake to mislead this House. Under the set of circumstances referred to, that section of the law applies to instances in which there is no State plan. But in the substitute, where you have a State plan, there is no opting out provision. I stand on that statement, and if I am not correct, show us in the bill where I am incorrect. We stand on the provision that where there is a State plan there is no opting out of that plan by a local community. If the program of a community is not a part of the State plan then there is no way to fund it.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say again to the chairman—and I hope he will listen at this time—in section 210(e) there is a provision for opting out. The substitute does not require the State to become a com-

munity action agency, and I say again the only thing the substitute does is to permit the State to assume some administrative responsibility presently in the hands of the regional office if the Director permits them to do so.

Mr. PERKINS. Let us clarify this. A community can opt out if the State has no plan. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. The community can opt out if the State becomes a community action agency.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, where the State has a plan and a community opts out, where are they going to get funds for their program?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. If the State becomes a community action agency, with or without a State plan, the community that wants to have a community action agency of its own can opt out under section 210(e) either way.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. QUIE. In either case, if the State has a plan, which I call a developmental and coordination plan, they will have to go through the State for their money, just as now they must go to the regional office.

Mr. PERKINS. If they opt out of the plan, where does the money come from?

Mr. REID of New York. I have yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota. He has the time to answer at this point.

Mr. QUIE. Under the present situation, all the communities get their money through the regional office. Under the substitute provision, if the State assumes that administrative responsibility of the regional office, with the support of the Director, they will get their money from the State office.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point for an observation?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have been intrigued by all this "opting out." I suggest that we "cop out" of the whole program.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York has never been more eloquent than when he did not open his mouth in the first 5 minutes. But I do crave the indulgence of the House for a few minutes to make a brief statement.

First, as all Members know, I have great respect for AL QUIE and BILL AYRES, the authors of this substitute. AL QUIE for a long time has favored a State plan approach. He has favored State control. This is not a new provision for AL. It is totally consistent with his position for some time.

In my judgment, however, the premise is incorrect. The premise is wrong. I think we have today a debate between the federalists and the antifederalists, between those who believe there is yet a role for the Federal Government in the poverty program and those who believe in turning it over almost lock, stock, and barrel to the States.

I should like first to point out the President's position as he initially enunciated it. He said, on October 11, and I

quote, that he "favors a 2-year extension of the existing legislation without crippling amendments."

It is my understanding that the Director of OEO, Mr. Rumsfeld, has informed the White House that he considered the first substitute and the second substitute to be crippling amendments. I read from a statement of his today which says specifically:

I appreciate the intensive efforts that have been made by many friends of the agency to ameliorate the most objectionable features of the proposed substitute bill. Unfortunately, the end result of that effort has fallen short of what is necessary for an effective program.

While several changes have been made in the substitute bill, the fact remains, by the testimony of the principal author, that they do not "change the substance of the substitute." I agree with that assessment. For that reason it remains my hope that the substitute bill will be defeated.

In my judgment as well, the second substitute does not represent a significant change. It continues to be a crippling amendment and it continues to turn over the programs essentially to the States.

I would say to the Members that there are still States in this Union that are institutions in need of change. The States are frequently indifferent to poverty. They frequently have shown lack of commitment. They have shown lack of technical expertise. They have in the main failed to show a capacity to act.

I would quote very briefly to the Members from a report of the Washington research project of the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and the NAACP legal defense and educational fund which says that title I of ESEA is not helping poor children. On one point the report concludes that "millions of dollars appropriated by the Congress to help educationally deprived children have been wasted, diverted or otherwise misused by State and local school authorities."

This is a vote of lack of confidence in State and local authorities in the area of education, and I think that uncertainty can be extended to the general area of State concern for the poor and the disadvantaged.

Some of the specifics in the substitute I believe should be clearly understood.

First, as to procedure, under present procedure a community action agency submits a plan to the regional OEO and then to the Washington OEO and in turn it goes back to the Governor of the State. Under the proposed substitute, the original local plan would go first to the State capital, where it would be a part of the entire State plan and it would—if the State approves—be referred by the State to Washington. This is a very different concept in terms of procedure. I believe it would largely vitiate the Federal role. I believe it would deprive the poor in local communities and the cities of an opportunity for meaningful participation in their own futures.

As a second point, VISTA would no longer continue to exist in its present form. It would no longer be a Federal program. VISTA would be set up separately in each separate State, if indeed it could be set up.

I would remind the House of President Nixon's comments on VISTA in his August 11 statement. He said:

Some proven programs which are national in scope should, however, remain in OEO because they can help us develop new experiments and because of the agency's special identification with the problems of the poor. The VISTA program is one example; it will make a greater effort to attract people with specific technical and professional skills to its ranks.

Section 810(b) of existing law already prohibits the assignment of volunteers to a State without the consent of the Governor. Frankly, I cannot see how this proposal will contribute to the maximum utilization of the energies and skills of those Americans who seek to help those less fortunate than themselves—which is, after all, what VISTA intended to do.

Finally, point No. 3: A series of other programs, such as legal services, family planning, comprehensive health services, emergency food and medical services, senior opportunities and services, Indians, and perhaps Headstart, Follow-through, and other components, would all have to be part of a State plan or in some way go through the State before they could be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

The point, very simply, is that the State could disapprove a portion of a plan, of any community action plan. The cities, for example, might have no recourse when there was a fundamental difference with the State or the State legislature.

So the question, I believe, is the issue of Federal versus State control, of Federal innovation versus, in some instances, State incompetence, lack of commitment or indifference.

I believe the substitute could go a long way toward destroying local control.

I would point out to the Members that the League of Cities of the United States has sent a very strong telegram in opposition to this substitute and points out that they are "categorically opposed to the channeling of OEO programs through State governments."

For these reasons, I would urge strong support for a continuation of the bill in its present form. There are other compelling reasons for defeat of the substitute as well.

The purpose of OEO is to encourage innovation and the development of initiative. OEO exists to attack problems that are not being solved by established Federal agencies or by State governments. Surely turning the program over to the States and their attendant courthouse bureaucracies is subverting that purpose. OEO Director Rumsfeld called the first substitute "a bureaucratic mess" and said that it "ignores the special relationship" between the Federal Government and the constituent groups of America's poor.

The black poor in the South and ghetto dwellers in the urban North do not enjoy the most amicable of relations with State

capitals, nor do they possess the political influence that regrettably will be necessary to insure that they get a fair share under a State plan. Quite simply, a State plan will, in most cases, shortchange the cities where most of the poverty exists.

The OEO Director may fund an application disapproved by a State office only if he finds that "approval of such application would strengthen the overall program plan of a local community action agency, or with respect to applications submitted by other eligible applicants, that the approval of such application would be in furtherance of the purposes of this act." This really gives the Director very little power to protect the interests of localities, especially since if he does make a positive funding under this section, the State could take the matter to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. The language of section 251(c)(1) does not provide the Director with a State bypass mechanism that will effectively protect the interests of cities shortchanged by States.

A case in point is the Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corp. in Brooklyn, founded in 1967 by the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy to develop the 600-square-block Bed-Stuy area, of some 450,000 residents, into a viable economic community. Two-thirds of Bed-Stuy's budget comes from title 1-D, special impact funds. An application is pending for \$13 million more over the next 2 years. It is highly unlikely at best that a State plan would or even could continue to provide this successful and innovative program with the level of support it now enjoys; a vital and important partnership between established business and financial interests and one of the most depressed ghetto communities in America may well have to come to a tragic halt.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the antipoverty program is making progress. The reason that it has not made more progress is not so much because of mistakes and mismanagement—although we must acknowledge that these have occurred—but because our effort to eliminate poverty is a weak attempt and not a wholehearted national commitment. We need only reread the report of the National Commission on Civil Disorders—the Kerner-Lindsay Commission—to discover that what the poverty program needs is vastly increased funding and some continuity. Instead, in this biennial travesty of the legislative process, we are again proposing to throw the entire poverty program to the States which, in the main, have shown little expertise and even less capacity to act.

We in the House tend to be concerned with the practical details to the neglect of what some of these programs mean in terms of those who participate and in terms of the needs of this Nation. We are always trying to run a tighter program; we are too rarely trying to structure a program that will meet the short- and long-term needs of this Nation and its citizens who live in poverty. We are always trying to save money; we are too rarely recognizing that it will take a very great deal of money to rid our cities of urban blight and make a better life for the rural poor. We seem to be wear-

ing blinders; we are, in short, guilty of legislating by delusion.

The administration with the substitute bill proposes to spend \$2.048 billion on antipoverty programs under OEO in the current fiscal year. This is \$100 million more than last year. It is still too little. It is, for example, half of what we spend annually on highway construction. The committee bill proposes to spend \$2.343 billion this year. That is an improvement but it is also too little. Some of our colleagues seem to think it is too much.

But let us look at what the Riot Commission report told us we had to do in March of 1968. First, it said, we must create 2 million new jobs—half in the public sector and half in the private sector—by 1971. But it seems that we have found slots in the JOBS program—the major private sector endeavor—for only 60,000 people this year. Other work-training programs under OEO will reach about 30,000 adults this year, and youth employment programs will assist some 45,000. Even if we add in other manpower programs, this is nowhere near the pace at which we should be proceeding.

In housing, the Kerner Commission said that we must construct and rehabilitate 6 million housing units for low- and moderate-income families in the next 5 years. The national housing goals, as reflected in legislation passed in 1968, has us reaching that goal in 10 years. But the actual rate of construction, even if there were full appropriations as there are not, means that we will only replace existing substandard units by 1982—not to speak of those which will decay in the intervening years. In short, we cannot even keep up with housing obsolescence, not to speak of making progress.

Housing development corporations, funded under OEO program grants, are a valuable tool in making ghetto residents aware of what they can do to help improve their housing situation—but they generated only 5,840 housing units last year. I point this out not to denigrate the importance of housing development corporations, but only to emphasize that one cannot make great strides on the \$3.5 million spent on this program last year.

The Commission addressed itself, too, to the spirit of the Nation, to the attitude that is a vital part of implementing its specific recommendations. The alternative to polarization and destruction of our basic democratic values, it said, "will require a commitment to national action—compassionate, massive, and sustained, backed by the resources of the most powerful and the richest nation on this earth. From every American it will require new attitudes, new understanding, and above all, new will."

The Congress should be the leader in providing that new will, that massive commitment to national action. But I submit that we—and the administration—do not lead, we do not even follow. Instead, we stifle all attempts at meeting the Kerner Commission's goals by parceling out niggardly appropriations, by disregarding—or paying lipservice to—the needs of our cities, by our obsessive concern with the cost-benefit returns of particular programs, and by at-

tempts to vitiate the poverty program by turning it over to the States.

I had hoped that our debate today could signal a reversal of this trend, a commitment, instead, to greater funding and constructive amendments. There is no doubt that in New York City and elsewhere funds have been commingled and misused, sometimes with criminal intent. But the fact of the matter is that some of the OEO programs have been successful, especially for an agency that is working with Americans who have never managed anything before, who never had any conception that they could shape their own lives. OEO, I think we should bear in mind as President Nixon has stated on many occasions, is an innovative agency that is experimenting with new concepts in an effort to stabilize those programs which are found to be most effective in lifting Americans out of poverty.

Headstart, for example, served 695,000 children in fiscal year 1968 and 664,000 in fiscal year 1969. That is only a fraction of the large number of children who require Headstart-type services. But aside from providing youngsters with sources of enrichment too often denied them in their own disadvantaged homes, mothers have become aware of the importance of their own involvement in their children's early lives and of the role they can play in bettering their communities. As a nation, we have suddenly awakened to the fact that if we do not reach the child by age 5 or 6—in terms of nutrition, intellectual enrichment, physical progress—his whole development may well be retarded.

Equally, disadvantaged Americans are realizing that ailments they have had for years can be treated, even though their ability to pay may be severely limited. By the end of last year, 300,000 persons were being served in the 49 comprehensive neighborhood health centers funded by OEO, and several thousand other Americans were being cared for in the health service programs established with local initiative grants.

As the committee report points out, the emergency food and medical service program demonstrates "that slim sums of money administered transitorily do not offer a satisfactory solution to the problem of hunger and malnutrition." EFMS operates 401 programs in 1,003 counties, serving over 1 million people. Approximately 37 percent of those assisted were able to buy food stamps for the first time, 58 percent were able to make food purchases from retail grocers, and 16 percent of EFMS families were given funds enabling their youngsters to participate in school lunch programs.

The administration has requested \$30 million to continue EFMS this year, an increase of \$6 million from the 1969 level. Yet this level of funding would prohibit the creation of any new programs and would force the curtailment of existing programs, to curb their natural growth rate. Clearly, the \$90 million recommended by the committee is a much more realistic sum, especially in light of the recalcitrance of the Agriculture Committee to make progress on the food stamp bill already passed by the Senate.

We must spare no effort and waste no more time in feeding the 14½ million hungry Americans. There are 307 counties which participate in neither the food stamp program nor the commodity distribution program—involving over 470,000 families. The President's action at the conclusion of the White House Conference on Nutrition last week in ordering that the food stamp program be extended to these counties within the next 6 months is a step that is long overdue, but it is still a far cry from seeing that all hungry are fed.

Finally, one of the most encouraging OEO programs has been legal services. Its accomplishments in statistical terms are impressive: 1,850 lawyers in 265 programs handling 610,000 cases. Of those litigated, 75 percent were successful, and 60 percent of appeals taken were also successful. More importantly, legal services has won landmark decisions: the Supreme Court rulings on the unconstitutionality of welfare residency requirements and the "substitute father" regulation in welfare programs. Decisions in several States have set important precedents in the areas of housing and medical aid. A bill of rights for public housing tenants is being developed and work is being done to modify the proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code on behalf of the poor.

These accomplishments and the work in progress are clear indications in their own right of why it would be disastrous and cruel for the Congress to approve the so-called Murphy amendment, giving Governors an absolute veto over legal services programs. Governors now have a veto over a community action program in its entirety. As I made plain in my remarks on the substitute, I do not believe they should be given an item veto over any portion of a local anti-poverty program, but to single out legal services as the whippingboy would be a gross disservice not only to the legally indigent but to all members of the bar.

President Nixon, Chief Justice Burger, OEO Director Rumsfeld, and virtually every national bar and legal association have spoken out against the Murphy amendment. It is the professional responsibility of a lawyer to represent any client or group of clients in regard to any cause no matter how unpopular, the resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association states. To discourage or interfere with the discharge of this obligation by the imposition of a Governor's veto is a very sad reflection on our political process and our regard for the canon of ethics.

Professional representation can provide substantial benefits in terms of overcoming the ghetto resident's alienation from the institutions of government by implicating him in its processes—

Stated the report of the Kerner Commission—

Although lawyers function in precisely this fashion for their middle-class clients, they are too often not available to the impoverished ghetto resident.

The report went on to say:

The Legal Services Program administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity has made a good beginning in providing legal

assistance to the poor. Its present level of effort should be substantially expanded.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the substitute. It is a question of backing the President's request for a 2-year extension without crippling amendments or opposing his position and that of the OEO Director, Mr. Rumsfeld. It is a question of the federalists versus the antifederalists; the issue is between those who believe that the elimination of poverty in America yet requires a strong Federal role and those who are content to leave it entirely to each of the States, some of whom have shown a massive and tragic record of indifference, incompetence, and lack of commitment to abolish hunger and poverty.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, the mayor of Chicago has not communicated with me, but I have received a communication from the Office of the Director of Economic Opportunity. I know about his position and that he wants an extension of this legislation without crippling amendments. He wants to have a chance to work out a better program than we have now. In my opinion, he deserves that chance. Mr. Rumsfeld served with great distinction in this House and he will do an outstanding job as Director of OEO if given an opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, when the President appointed our former colleague, Don Rumsfeld, the House lost one of its most able Members. While many of us may question the wisdom of his decision in leaving the House and accepting an appointment as Director of OEO, I want to state in my own behalf that I gained confidence in the poverty program which I did not have before.

I would not say that many changes are not required and desirable. Indeed, the substitute bill which is to be offered, may contain elements which would improve the existing program.

But what I say is this: the legislation creating the Office of Economic Opportunity was not thought out carefully and fully when it was first enacted. At this time, it seems to me, it should not be subjected to wholesale revision until a careful and thoughtful review of proposed changes is completed.

As I understand it, Director Rumsfeld wants a brief extension of the existing law without crippling amendments. He is supported in this by the President.

In my opinion, the program deserves this opportunity—and the new director is entitled to a chance to develop the changes which he deems necessary in order to make the attack on poverty more effective. An extension of the law for 2 years would give time for making these necessary changes.

Mr. Chairman, I prefer to support the new director and the President on the bill before us—in the hope that the war on poverty may be more successful in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think my colleague would be interested to know that this gentleman appeared before our subcommittee and supported your position.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute which the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) will introduce later today.

I am intrigued by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) quoting the great mayor of Chicago, Mayor Daley, whom I greatly admire. I can assure the gentleman that this is about the only instance in which the people of OEO agree with Mayor Daley.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of discussion about whether or not OEO should be under State or local governmental control. It is interesting to compare the provisions of the committee bill with the provisions that were made several years ago when there was concern about the fact that city hall might grasp control of these programs or that the States might grasp control of these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you today that the history of OEO indicates that it does not want the control of this program in the hands of the people and city hall. It does not want control of this program to be in the hands of the State governments. It does not want control of this program by the people in the executive branch of the Federal Government and it does not want any control or interference by Congress itself.

This is very clearly in its history. It has circumvented the will of this Congress time and time again. It has circumvented the mandate of this Congress. It has no respect for certain governmental bodies, whether State, local, or Federal. OEO prefers to think of itself as something separate from government. I submit that it has failed miserably.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to programs designed to help the poor. My record has been clear. I will say to my colleagues, particularly those from the North and from the industrial and urban States, that I have supported every program designed to help alleviate the problems of the poor. In the years I have been here, I have supported programs in education, housing, food, health care, vocational training, and the many other programs we have initiated in this Congress which now totals somewhere in the neighborhood of \$25 billion a year.

The OEO is just a small aspect of the overall poverty program; an agency which spends approximately \$2 billion out of that \$25 billion.

I am not opposed to using this \$2 billion to help the poor of our cities. I submit to you, however, that under this program with its miserable record of failure, with its record of corruption and, yes, with its record in quite a few instances of actively inciting disorder and violence, we have helped neither the poor nor ourselves in resolving our urban problems.

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary that this \$2 billion be expended wisely so that it gets into the hands of the poor instead of the hands of these professional poverty brokers who have used this money too often for their own benefit.

As the gentlewoman from Oregon pointed out when she listed many of the areas of activity where funds have gone, we must restructure this program. We must listen to the complaints of the American people, those who are aware of the shortcomings of the poverty programs and community action programs and take action so that they will give us a vote of confidence. This program has not developed such a great record that it needs no change; that it can simply be continued as is.

The time for change is today. Indeed, the time for change is long past due. We have been derelict because we have not changed and restructured this program before now. We have to restructure this program.

I submit that these types of programs will not work if they are administered at the Federal level and through the regional offices. I submit that these programs—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, these programs must be administered through the governments which are closest to the people. By that I mean by the State governments, and through them the local governments; elected governments; governments which are responsible, accountable, and capable in the way they expend the funds and utilize the authority which the program gives them.

OEO's record has been so poor since its very inception that the time has come to try a new approach in assisting the States with funds and allowing them to conduct these programs in order to see what they can do. I submit to my colleagues that the States can do no worse than we have done at the Federal level these past years. Indeed, they will do better.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN).

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have not been known, I suppose, as one of the greater supporters of the poverty program over the years. As a matter of fact, I have been from time to time one of its critics. Most of my criticism has been leveled at two aspects of the poverty program, the Job Corps and community action.

Earlier this year the President responded to the requests and the desires of many Members of the Congress and other people in this country to do something about the Job Corps; to coordinate it with other manpower programs, and ordered a delegation of the Job Corps to the Department of Labor, which has now been concluded. Administration of the Job Corps program with other manpower elements of the Economic Opportunity

Act is now in the Department of Labor where I believe it should be.

At the same time, the President ordered the delegation of the Headstart program from the OEO to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This has been concluded and most of the Headstart functions are now under administrative control of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

One major thing left in the OEO, which has been the most abrasive force in the OEO, is the community action program. I have felt that there should be more meaningful participation at the local level by elected officials in the community action programs to lessen the abrasive quality of these programs and the conflicts that have risen.

The gentleman from Minnesota and I, a couple of years ago, thought that the gentlewoman from Oregon went too far in her amendment providing that the cities, the counties, and the States themselves could be designated as community action agencies. I resisted that amendment which was adopted by this House, because I did not believe we should turn the day-by-day operations of the community action program over to only elected officials, even though they should have a more meaningful role in the community action programs.

This year the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentlewoman from Oregon, the gentleman from Ohio and others have joined together in presenting this substitute bill which will be offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute later today.

This I think will give more participation at the State level, and does not go as far as the provisions we adopted a few years ago, which incidentally have not been implemented by any States, and by very few communities.

I was not willing to accept the substitute bill when it was first offered because I felt that it was deficient in several respects. I would like to go through a few of these that I believe have been remedied in the substitute that will be offered this afternoon. Together with some of my other Republican colleagues on the Committee on Education, I worked this week with the gentleman from Minnesota in trying to resolve those problems that we saw in the substitute.

The first that I will call your attention to is in 250(c)1 of the substitute, which has to do with the first phase of the operation of the substitute bill at the point when the State economic opportunity office will be a reviewing agent for applications under the community action provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act.

We have in our agreement brought the Governor into this process so that we would not have a duel review, one by the State economic opportunity office and one by the Governor, and an adverse comment by the office and then a veto by the Governor.

So we now provide that the State economic opportunity office and the Governor must concur in any adverse recommendation against the application for assistance under this program.

Then so that it would be clear that

single purpose agencies could be funded, even after an adverse recommendation, we have added language that allows other eligible applicants other than community action agencies, to be funded over an adverse recommendation.

Then in section 253(a)(6), many of us were concerned that this was giving a charter to the State economic opportunity agency to be the coordinating agency for all federally assisted programs within a State.

We have tightened this down so that they will be the coordinator for assistance under the community action section.

With reference to section 253(C)(1) we provided for a bypass around the State planning operation so that a qualified community agency or a single purpose unit such as legal assistance, which so many in this House were worried about in relation to the Murphy amendment, can be funded. We provide an opportunity to the Director to go around the State office of economic opportunity and fund legal services programs or community health service programs and emergency food and medical assistance programs.

One thing that we were not able to reach accommodation on, and I hope we will be able to remedy this by amendment, is the problem of Headstart.

As I said originally, Headstart is properly delegated to HEW.

But then the substitute, as now drafted, will put the State economic opportunity office right back in the Headstart business, instead of having that direct line from the local agency to HEW.

This substitute will put the State economic opportunity office in the act, so that the flow of applications would go from the community action agency to the State economic opportunity office, and then back to the HEW.

I hope that when the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) offers an amendment to exempt Headstart from the operation of this substitute that he will be supported.

Mr. Chairman, with these several reservations, I do support the substitute and I hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to recognize first of all that the legislative process will not end with the passage of the bill but will continue on in the conference committee.

The most important thing for this body to do is to extend the life of the OEO programs. We recognize that there have been serious abuses that have been made under past OEO. But, hopefully, these will be corrected in the future.

There are many of us who are concerned that the substitute bill does not even address itself to those abuses. However, with the understanding that it is essential that we pass the OEO bill on this floor today, many of us, as was indicated by the previous speaker, have worked diligently attempting to perfect major errors in the substitute as it was originally proposed.

Mr. Chairman, let us direct dialog to these improvements.

First of all, do we have a proper bypass vehicle in the substitute?

The answer is definitely yes. First of all, the so-called Murphy amendment will not be a part of the substitute as presented this afternoon. I think that is essential.

Second, the special emphasis programs may be utilized by the director in a unilateral relationship between the Director and the local agencies where he deems it necessary. This can be done by the Director using up to 25 percent of the funds. And the Director can fund these programs, such as food distribution and legal aid, without having to prove that the States are derelict.

Thus the special emphasis programs will continue without having a direct confrontation with the States. That, too, is essential.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN), has alluded to the fact that there are one or two other major problems in the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the committee deliberation which follows this general debate, it is my intention to offer an amendment to the substitute bill which would exempt all Headstart programs from the substitute.

I believe it is essential that we retain the present status of the Headstart program and not allow any action which would jeopardize the ongoing efficiency and effectiveness and the future direction of the program.

One of the major actions undertaken by President Nixon has been a gradual transfer of Headstart programs into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This transfer has begun and is being pursued in a manner so as not to disrupt seriously the effectiveness of local Headstart groups. It has been done with a minimum of dislocation and difficulty. My amendment will allow continuation of this process.

At the present, under the delegation of authority afforded the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under section 602, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been given responsibility for the maintenance of a quality Headstart program. Health, Education, and Welfare has been given authority to initiate contracts directly with public and private nonprofit organizations in local communities. If this amendment is not adopted then applications for existing and future Headstart programs will have to be funneled through State OEO boards and then forwarded to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, imposing an additional layer of bureaucracy, redtape and delay. Additionally, if a State board were to reject a Headstart application and the bypass provisions called into action, the present situation in the substitute would cause direct and unnecessary confrontation between Federal and State officials.

I have discussed this entire matter in some detail with Secretary Finch this morning. He expressed grave concern about the problems which would be caused by the inclusion of Headstart in the provisions of the substitute. The Secretary indicated that the orderly

transfer of Headstart programs would be seriously impaired if we do not exempt these programs from the direction of the substitute bill.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no program in all of our war against poverty which has been more effective and has received wider public acceptance than Headstart. The Nation has made a commitment to aid the very young who are disadvantaged through no fault of their own. I call upon the Congress to consider carefully the broken hopes and lost opportunities for reaching these children if the Headstart program is seriously impaired. We simply cannot risk the future of these children for political purposes.

My colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK), will offer another amendment which is equally, I believe, vital in the area of the VISTA programs, and we hope that we can have a continuation of the perfecting of the substitute as we continue the debate today.

It is important, I think, as we look ahead to realize that the final bill that passes and passes the Congress today may well not resemble what has passed the House here today. It may not anymore resemble what we pass today than that tax bill that finally comes out of the conference committee will resemble what we originally passed. The essential element is that we continue the OEO authorization.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the situation in which the House finds itself today is not unique. It is the same type of situation in which the House found itself 2 years ago during consideration of this same bill.

I am one of those who has worked with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK), in an effort to perfect and improve the provisions of the substitute bill that will be offered here by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES).

The gentleman from Illinois has outlined fully what I consider to be significant improvements in the substitute amendment so that the role of the States and the role of the Director are somewhat more clarified. There have been modifications in certain sections that were unrelated to the State plan, such as that section that would have required a VISTA legal service lawyer to have been a member of the State bar. That provision has been dropped. And that provision of the political activity amendment which would have proposed requirements far and away and above those which are applicable to any other Federal, State, or local employee and would have gone so far as to make the political activity prohibitions under the State act applicable to the private employee of the Westinghouse Learning Corp., or a university—those provisions have been modified as well.

The significant parts of the substitute which have been discussed do go to the substance of the substitute and have been

discussed in more detail by the gentleman from Illinois, and I would refer any who are interested to his remarks. I share them.

I also want to make clear that I do intend to offer further perfecting amendments in an effort to make the substitute an even better substitute, one that will do a more effective job of work with the agency and work on the problems of the poor of this country.

And let me suggest to my colleagues, whether they are for or against the substitute, that the rhetoric of the relationship between the States and the regional offices is not terribly relevant.

I must say that I am not one of those who is going to characterize the people in State government as being less responsible than those who serve in the OEO agency in the regional office. I just do not think that that is the case. But I think it would be unfair and unwise not to recognize the major changes in the agency that have been undertaken by the new Director, Mr. Rumsfeld, under the charter given to OFO by Mr. Nixon.

So I shall offer a series—not many—of perfecting amendments in an effort to do a better job with the substitute. I intend to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) taking VISTA out completely. I intend to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) to exempt Headstart completely. I propose that we clarify the public members amendment that is contained in the substitute, which I think is not well drawn. I also intend to propose that the States share in the administrative costs of the State developmental and coordination plan, something that the substitute simply does not address itself to and which I do think is important.

I also want to make a comment about that section which has been agreed to in the substitute which was a part of an amendment offered by myself and agreed to by the authors in terms of the criteria to be developed by the Director of OEO under section 253(b).

The amendment which was offered by myself and agreed to by the authors of the substitute to the substitute requires that the Director establish criteria for the approval of State developmental and coordination programs and that he approve such programs when he finds that such criteria and other requirements for approval already contained in the bill, have been met.

The purpose of this section is to insure that the States will know in advance what they must do if their programs are to be approved by the Director. It also enables the Director to take necessary steps to insure that the State-run programs will fulfill the purposes specified for them in the act both with respect to their content and mode of operation.

Section 210 of the act provides, for example, that community action programs must "include a sufficient number of projects or components to provide, in sum, a range of services and activities having a measurable and potentially major impact on the causes of poverty in the community." These are very general pro-

visions, and the Director is authorized under this section to develop supplementary criteria concerning their content. This amendment affords the Director the opportunity to inform the States as to what their programs must contain to be approved. It also enables him to establish requirements concerning their operation which will assure that the purposes of the act will be promoted.

This section should help allay any fears that granting the States a larger role in the development and conduct of Economic Opportunity Act programs will result in the elimination of some valuable programs in hostile local environments. It should also reassure anyone who is apprehensive that programs such as legal services will be so inhibited in their operation as to curtail their potential for effecting orderly social change.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the Members of the House that with all the sound and fury that will take place in the debate here today on the substitute amendment and on the extension of the Office of Economic Opportunity, I want to make clear my own commitment to OEO and I want to make clear my own commitment to extending the life of OEO so that we will have a vehicle that can go to conference. I hope the substitute amendment is substantially changed in conference so that we can make further modifications that those agreed to by the authors of the substitute.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Before I yield I will make this statement: One of the difficulties, even under the substitute, which does attack some of the problems inherent in the agency—given the way it was passed, the time in which it was passed, and the politics played with the agency—is that the substitute, let us face it, is not going to correct some of the basic defects inherent in the agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity. I shall support the substitute while saying in all candor that it is far from perfect. It nonetheless can serve to get this bill to conference and that is essential.

Mr. Chairman, I support a 2-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. I do so on the basis of my conviction that the problems of poverty in the Nation require priority attention, and my belief that the new thrust of the Office of Economic Opportunity, under the leadership of our former colleague, Donald Rumsfeld, promises effective action in this critical area.

None can doubt the commitment of this administration to the task of overcoming the blight of poverty and the human and material waste that it fosters. Nor can there be any doubt as to the central role assigned the Office of Economic Opportunity in that undertaking.

On four separate occasions, President Nixon has reaffirmed his determination to marshal the resources of the Federal Government to combat the scourge of poverty and to employ the unique skills of the Office of Economic Opportunity in that process.

On February 19, less than a month after his inauguration, the President an-

nounced his intention to seek continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity as an innovative agency having special capabilities and experience in dealing with the poor. On June 2 he issued a statement requesting a 2-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The President stated:

If we are to make lasting significant headway against poverty, there still is a great deal to be learned about what works and what does not. This Administration is committed to search for that knowledge, and to use it. We are committed to the continuation of an agency whose special concern is the poor; and we are determined to make the Nation's anti-poverty efforts function more efficiently and serve the poor more effectively.

On August 11, the President announced a major reorganization of OEO and assigned it the task of serving as "the R. & D. arm for Government's social programs." He stated:

I believe that the goal of full economic opportunity for every American can be realized. I expect the Office of Economic Opportunity to play a central role in that achievement. With new organizational structures, new operating procedures, and a new sense of precision and direction, OEO can be one of the most creative and productive offices in the government. For here much of our social pioneering will be done. Here will begin many of our new adventures."

Again in his October 11 legislative message to Congress, the President reaffirmed his position. He stated:

I have asked for a two-year extension of the existing legislation, without crippling amendments. I believe that a reformed OEO has a major and continuing role to play in our national life.

Mr. Chairman, I support the President in seeking approval of this measure, and urge my colleagues to do the same. Our support is warranted, not only by the urgency of the problems to which this legislation is addressed, but also by the encouraging progress made by Donald Rumsfeld in strengthening the performance of OEO, and the promise which the agency shows for effective action.

Like many of the Members, I was dismayed by the aimless and unordered administration of our antipoverty program which formerly characterized the Office of Economic Opportunity. In part, this weakness stemmed from an inherent conflict in the roles which OEO was seeking to fill—a subject on which I shall have more to say in a moment. But it also stemmed from a failure to identify priorities and to employ the resources of State and local governments in cooperative enterprise.

In the short period of 6 months since he assumed direction of the agency, Donald Rumsfeld has acted to overcome these weaknesses and to establish a more orderly set of priorities. I believe the steps he is taking offer great promise that the Office of Economic Opportunity will at last realize its potential for providing the clear direction and sound administration that the poor of this Nation deserve.

Among the principal reforms which the Director has instituted is the establishment of a more meaningful role for State and local government in the administration of programs under the act—

a role which encourages rather than discourages participation by elected officials, but one which at the same time preserves the capacity of the agency to implement a national strategy for combating poverty.

The Director has established a new division of State and local government within the agency to facilitate greater participation by State and local officials in OEO activities. He has budgeted a 30-percent increase in the funding level of State economic opportunity offices. He has set aside funds to train employees of these State agencies and made planning grants to 13 States to help strengthen their planning capabilities. Further, administrative changes are under way to greatly expand and strengthen the role of State officials in the preparation of funding plans and the monitoring and evaluation of OEO projects.

This sweeping series of reforms will enable OEO to marshal the resources and capabilities of local and State governments in attacking the root causes of poverty. But at the same time, it recognizes, as did the President in his welfare reform message, that poverty and its consequences constitute a national problem—one that requires a coordinated national approach if realistic solutions are to be devised. Accordingly, while the Director's reorganization harnesses the support and talents of local and State government, it preserves the capacity of OEO to initiate and implement national strategy for attacking poverty, and it avoids the pitfall of diluting national emphasis. It creates a desirable balance between Federal and regional approaches to the problem, and thereby avoids the risk of "Balkanizing" the war on poverty.

I share the concern of many Members at the amendment adopted by the Senate which would extend the application of a Governor's veto over legal services programs. In my judgment, such a provision would do serious damage to the legal services program by limiting the access of low-income citizens to our legal institutions. As Mr. Rumsfeld has stated:

We cannot expect respect for the rule of law if we, as public officials, do not assure access to the legal process. To fail to do so would break faith with those Americans—rich and poor alike—who have confidence in our legal institutions and the notion that disputes are better resolved in courtrooms than on street corners.

Such a limitation runs counter to the concept of equal justice and traditional lawyer independence in the service of a client and is opposed vigorously by the American Bar Association. In addition, the Judicial Conference has expressed its opposition to the veto amendment. Lawyers are very proud of their independence in representing the interests of their clients, whether they be public or private, and that sense of independence, we believe, must not suffer inhibition. Such inhibition would have a deleterious effect on not only the OEO legal services program, but also on all public legal programs.

Moreover, this limitation would be counter-productive for yet a more basic reason. Many Members—and I count myself among them—feel a deep concern

about needless turmoil and unproductive controversy which has been associated with a number of antipoverty programs. While recognizing the inevitability, and in some cases the desirability of a certain amount of discord in times of social change, disruption for its own sake has no value. Yet at the same time we must recognize that discord and disruption reflect the existence of serious problems in our society.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is uniquely qualified to identify those problems for us and to serve as an advocate for those among the poor who seek constructively to change unfair and unequal conditions. Too often in the past, however, that advocacy function has found expression in abrasive and undisciplined conduct. It is far more constructive, in my judgment, for the problems which engender complaint to be expressed by legal services attorneys in courtrooms across the country.

As part of his reorganization, the Director elevated the Office of Legal Services to the status of a separate division reporting directly to him. Mr. Rumsfeld stated:

The poor must have effective legal representation—the kind of advocacy on which our legal system rests—if they are to have faith that justice is truly equal and that it can be achieved within the existing system of law. We cannot restrict lawyers from giving their clients that representation which the highest standards of the profession require without encouraging those denied to seek change outside the legal system.

The impact of the Senate amendment is directly contrary to this aspiration. By placing restrictions on the independence of legal services attorneys to represent the interests of their clients, this amendment would undercut the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity which seeks to channel the problems of the poor out of the streets and into the courtrooms. It is no doubt true that some of the cases which these attorneys file are controversial and raise perplexing problems, but our legal system has been developed over a period of two centuries for the express purpose of settling disputes among citizens and resolving problems in our society.

One of the obstacles to full realization of the lofty goals set for OEO has been an inherent conflict in the functions which it has sought to perform. One of the most encouraging aspects of Donald Rumsfeld's administration of OEO has been a clear effort to resolve these conflicts.

My reference is the inherent conflict between the mission of expressing the legitimate concerns of the poor and advocating programs to alleviate those concerns on the one hand and, on the other hand, coordinating existing antipoverty efforts, some of which are responsible for creating those concerns in the first instance. It is difficult to resolve, within the same agency, the function of advocating change and the function of coordinating the efforts of public officials who may be resisting change.

Similarly, a conflict in roles results where the agency is charged, on the one hand, with devising innovative experimental programs to alleviate conditions of poverty, and expected on the other

hand to continue the function of administering established operating programs.

The result of these conflicts has been inefficient administration and insufficient performance. But now the conflicts appear to have been resolved. The Office of Economic Opportunity is no longer responsible for coordinating the antipoverty efforts of other agencies. It is thus free to pursue single mindedly its unique role of advocating the kinds of change and accommodation needed to effectively root out the underlying cause of poverty. Similarly, except for a few programs which it is particularly well qualified to manage, it is no longer engaged in administering established antipoverty programs, but is free to pursue the experimental and innovative programs which are its primary mission under the new administration.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me quote the remarks of Director Rumsfeld, made before the Committee on Education and Labor in June of this year, which succinctly summarize the mission of the Office of Economic Opportunity under this administration.

We must develop more systematic approaches to identifying the needs of the poverty population and to devising effective solutions to those needs. The people served by OEO deserve this. The people of the Nation require it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

At this point in the proceedings each side has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS).

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, today we shall hear many Members urge us to vote in favor of the OEO amendment, an amendment which in my opinion would deal a fatal blow to this vital program. Let us be honest with ourselves, an amendment such as this will not eliminate a few minor bureaucratic problems that now exist but will escalate the problems in every State in the Union. The people whose needs are the greatest will be the most severely hurt by the amendment because the States in which they live will be the last to act on implementing the needed programs.

Many of the Members on the other side of the aisle are urging us to support this amendment. They say an amendment such as this would enable each State to institute its own program, which would be designed to meet its particular needs. They say it will increase efficiency and eliminate some of the administrative problems. Do not our distinguished Members who are in favor of this amendment realize that such an amendment would not only jeopardize the efficiency and administration of the program, but would hurt and demoralize all those who are honestly working to help their fellow man.

I want my colleagues who believe that the OEO programs are not fulfilling their function to discuss their drawbacks, and not skirt the issue by presenting a so-

called improving amendment. If the objective is to kill the OEO program, let them say so and not support an amendment that pretends to better the program while in fact it destroys it. If any proof is needed that the end of the anti-poverty program is the goal of this amendment, I would just like to cite one example that proves my case.

VISTA is perhaps the most responsive program yet devised to grapple with the basic problems of poverty. It is not and cannot be a sovereign remedy to poverty but it has produced real results. Americans concerned with poverty, volunteers, work full time on the scene, to do something about the bad health, lack of education, the lack of jobs, the lack of opportunity—the problems that give us the length and breadth and depth of poverty. Since 1965, 20,000 Americans have volunteered to serve a year. Some 40 percent of them have served beyond the original year of their commitment. Increasingly in the last year or two they have been people with special professional skills—lawyers, business school graduates, health specialists, teachers. They have been sent into the slums, urban and rural, not to preach, not to carp, not to complain but to use the skills to change the fundamental facts that can doom a man, a family, to hunger and frustration, ill health and pointless lives.

They have helped. They have helped arrange for hungry children to be fed, for school dropouts to be taught, for poor men to become self-supporting business entrepreneurs, and for people in shacks to obtain decent homes of their own.

There are now some 5,000 VISTA volunteers in the field. Some have made mistakes, some have been harshly criticized. They have seldom been criticized by the poor. They have made, I would say, fewer mistakes than almost any other group working in this most difficult and frustrating field. They have achieved and are achieving real, significant results, and are changing the lives of some of the poor, permanently.

This amendment would destroy their work. It would replace the program with 50 separate programs, each run by a State. The amendment as offered is staggering, the prospect chaotic. The administrative costs would jump gigantically. The training and recruiting and selection machinery would not be merely duplicated—it could be multiplied by 50. VISTA now puts a full time lawyer or business graduate or architect in the service of poor communities for some \$4,400 a year. With the fragmentation of the program into 50 parts the cost would necessarily skyrocket as the matching of skills with jobs declined.

In truth, this amendment would kill this organization of volunteers by substituting confusion for order and chaos for efficiency.

The anti-poverty program has effectively and efficiently accomplished much of what it was designed to do—there is, however, more to be done.

I urge my colleagues, not to disappoint those people who still believe in America and our system of Government. The present OEO program has proven itself in the helping of others. Let us not

destroy it by voting in favor of this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the so-called substitute bill does not substitute, it destroys. What it would create is but a hollow sham. It is the death knell of an idea I helped foster and nurture, and, with great pride, saw realized in VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America.

VISTA has proven itself an effective opportunity for individual Americans—particularly young Americans—to participate personally and actively in the Nation's business. It has channeled more than 20,000 full-time volunteers and more than 100,000 part-time volunteers into constructive programs dealing with the Nation's most pressing social problems. It has flourished each year in an atmosphere of increasing popularity and demand for its services. As a matter of fact, in spite of every effort to discourage additional requests which cannot be filled, VISTA has requests from local communities for five times the number of volunteers its budget will support. Most of these come from communities that already have volunteers and know from their own experience the contribution they can make.

The dramatic public response to VISTA in just 4 years clearly illustrates the widespread acceptance and approval of a program that works. Each year has brought successes. Each year has brought management efficiencies that have reduced volunteer costs. Each year has brought changes and improvements that have strengthened the program and enabled it to grow. A little over a year ago, VISTA completed an exhaustive evaluation of its projects that resulted in significant advances. Today's VISTA has better volunteers, better projects, better supervision and better training than ever before. These improvements are the result of sweeping and constructive changes. Why change a system that works? Why kill an idea whose time has come?

This administration has proclaimed its commitment to voluntarism. And VISTA, the only full-time domestic volunteer service makes that commitment live. A recent Gallup poll demonstrated that 56 percent of all college students—more than 3 million of them—expressed interest in VISTA service. And, in another poll, 73 percent of all parents sampled wanted their sons to join VISTA. In fact, VISTA is now more popular on college campuses than even the Peace Corps. This is but one indicator of VISTA's potential as an outlet for the concern of our Nation's youth. VISTA's national recruitment is at an all time high. Not only are there more applications but the people applying are of significantly higher quality. VISTA has toughened its national recruitment and selection. Volunteers entering service now are older, more experienced, and more highly skilled. Nearly one out of two entering VISTA have professional skills; lawyers, business school graduates, urban plan-

ners, architects, and nutritionists. In fact, VISTA recruited one out of every 17 lawyers graduating from law schools this summer. More than one out of three volunteers entering are from minority groups or the ranks of the poor. Some 73 percent of all applicants selected are college graduates as compared to 49 percent a year ago.

These accomplishments cannot be credited to tougher criteria alone. They underscore the higher quality of men and women who now look to VISTA for an opportunity for service. They demonstrate the appeal of VISTA's national reputation, national emphasis, and national stature.

And yet, with the brightest of prospects, VISTA's future now lies in doubt. For the proposed bill on the floor carries within it a crippling substitute for the progress and promise of VISTA.

In response to urgings by the House Education and Labor Committee, VISTA has gone out and recruited thousands of nurses, lawyers, business specialists and other skilled volunteers. VISTA distributes its highly trained volunteers among all States according to need and regardless of where they are from. This efficient and equitable distribution of skills and talent, in response to requests from the States and local communities and approved by the States, reflects a nation's concern for all of its poor.

And the presence of skilled VISTA volunteers in local programs is having a profound impact on the problems of the poor. VISTA volunteers are providing scarce technical assistance. They are stimulating self-help housing; helping the poor to start credit unions, producer co-ops, buying clubs, and other institutions of economic self-help.

VISTA volunteers with graduate degrees in business and law are helping new entrepreneurs to solve the basic problems of starting and maintaining businesses. They are tackling the problems of capitalization, refinancing, and marketing. Their involvement is direct, constant, and productive.

Let me give you just one example. In the last year, four VISTA volunteers—all with degrees in business administration—have been providing technical assistance to poor people in the ghetto of San Francisco. They have helped 15 new businesses come into existence. They have given technical assistance to more than 100 ghetto entrepreneurs. The income accruing from the growth of each of the companies started with the help of the VISTA volunteers will average about \$40,000 per year. For 15 companies, that comes to some \$600,000 in new income. Their guidance to other businessmen helped to generate over \$300,000 in public and private credit loans. They recruited senior employees of Kaiser, Price-Waterhouse, Arthur D. Little, Safeway, and other companies to serve as part-time volunteers in a new Technical Assistance Corps. These businessmen and lawyers contributed over 1,000 hours of their time free of charge. At the average market price of \$50 an hour for professional consultation, these services were worth \$50,000. The total benefits derived from the work of just four skilled

volunteers on one project totalled \$950,000. The cost to VISTA for support of the volunteers: \$14,000.

That is what the skilled volunteers now entering VISTA are doing. That is why they are so valuable and so keenly sought after. That is what VISTA is able to do under the present legislation. This year VISTA is planning to field some 2,500 volunteers with professional skills. Next year that number will grow even more. Those volunteers will definitely be worth their weight in gold.

The proposed bill would short-circuit this source of valuable talent. It will cause saturation of technical services in those few areas which produce the most skilled volunteers and starvation in the poorer, more rural areas where they are in short supply. This bill is no friend to rural states because it will penalize those areas that provide fewer volunteers and particularly fewer skilled volunteers.

I am told that the alleged purpose of the proposed substitute bill is to give States and local communities control of VISTA. Yet, the Governors of the various States already do control VISTA under present legislation. Indeed, VISTA's success is dependent upon local sponsorship and local supervision of volunteers. That concept is a firm philosophical and legislative requirement of the program. And it is not just rhetoric.

VISTA makes sure that every program has the full support of the Governor of the State involved. Current legislation requires that Governors must approve every VISTA project in writing before one volunteer can be assigned. Furthermore, if a Governor should change his mind at any time during the operation of an approved project, the volunteers would be withdrawn within 30 days. The existing legislation provides one additional assurance of complete and effective control of VISTA projects by States and local communities: A Governor's veto of a VISTA project is one that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity by legislation cannot override.

VISTA volunteers are already locally sponsored, locally supervised, and locally controlled. What is more, they are even locally trained. Through VISTA's regional training centers, volunteers are now trained in the community and on the very job where they will be assigned. After 2 weeks of general orientation, VISTA volunteers now get 4 weeks on-the-job training, which involves not only the training center staff but the staff of the local agency which the volunteers will serve. The process is efficient; the cost is about the lowest for training in the country. Yet in its place, the substitute bill would require creation of at least 50 training centers instead of seven and that can only skyrocket training costs and create a staggering overhead burden.

The bill will not increase the degree of local supervision and local control of VISTA volunteers. It will, however, require a multiplicity of administrative structures where now one does the job effectively. Separate state and local recruiting, selection, and training operations will require more staff, more overhead dollars, and more bureaucrats. If States were to recruit only within their

own boundaries for volunteers, the smaller—and frequently poorer and more rural States—would starve for service. Yet, if States had to recruit beyond their boundaries, there would be the expensive proliferation of visits to out-of-State colleges and universities. The cost of putting a volunteer in the field would be so great that I cannot fathom how the expenditure could be justified.

And where will the money go? Not to the poor, not to more volunteers, but to more high salaried bureaucrats. This bill seeks to create new and unnecessary administrative structures. It will decrease the number of dedicated, skilled volunteers serving the poor. Let us not be deceived: a bill which replaces volunteer workers with salaried bureaucrats does only a cruel disservice to the poor.

The American people have already expressed their support for VISTA as the single most constructive outlet for our dedicated and qualified Americans who are looking not for money but for an opportunity to serve. The Senate has already given its strong endorsement. If there are those who do not feel it necessary to assist the poor or necessary to provide this effective opportunity for those who want to serve, let them proclaim themselves now. But for those who would truly seek to help the poor, I urge you to reject a measure that would aid not the poor, but those who would profit. I urge you to reject a bill that substitutes waste and expense for positive and productive service. I urge you to consider carefully the full meaning of this substitute bill and reject it.

Following are some quotations supporting VISTA from leading national figures who have had experience with it:

Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York: "New York City needs 500 VISTA Volunteers today. Their greatest virtue is that they have been chosen to spend a year of their lives, 24 hours a day among the poor. New York needs more people with this kind of commitment."

John D. Rockefeller III: "VISTA is a very valuable program that channels the concern of the young into a constructive and meaningful service."

Jerome P. Cavanagh, former Mayor of Detroit: "One of the most important post-riot tasks was handled almost exclusively by the VISTA workers. The Volunteers were hard-working, energetic, dedicated and, without exception, they were a credit to their program."

Cyrus Vance, the President's personal representative in Detroit during the crisis, congratulating VISTA Volunteers on the outstanding job which they did: "They have won the respect and admiration of everyone."

William Gossett, former President of the A.B.A.: "VISTA lawyers are a new breed. They represent a tremendously valuable asset to the poor and to the nation. To be commended."

Earl Old Person, President of the National Congress of American Indians: "VISTA Volunteers have been active and personally dedicated in helping my people help our community. VISTA Volunteers have helped erase the image of the bare-chested Indian decorated with warpaint. VISTA is a great help to our people."

Calvin L. Rampton, Governor of Utah: "I urge the citizens of Utah to catch the idealism of these gifted and dedicated people, cooperate with them in their noble endeavors to serve the poor."

Senator Clifford Hansen, Wyoming: (Through VISTA) . . . "Wyoming people can carry their spirit and skill into the hol-

lows of Appalachia, the villages of Alaska, and in rural and urban communities wherever poverty exists."

Louie Welch, Mayor of Houston: "VISTA is continuing its devoted service to people who live in poverty."

Tim Martinez, GOP County Chairman, Costilla County, Colorado: "We have found VISTA Volunteers now working in our communities are doing a terrific job in helping low income people eliminate poverty."

League of Women Voters, Boise, Idaho (spokesman, Maureen Darling): "Any amendments to the House Resolutions which would change the present concept of VISTA will reduce the effectiveness of this important corps of public servants. Urge support of administration bill with no amendments."

Roger D. Branigin, former Governor of Indiana: "I urge everyone who has a desire to take an active part in the War on Poverty to investigate the VISTA Program. For one year these Volunteers devote their time, energy and talents to assisting people who live in poverty areas."

Edward Breathitt, former Governor of Kentucky: "The Volunteers get no publicity and no salary. Their only concern has been to help people in communities that have asked for their assistance. We think they have done a tremendous job."

George C. Whitmer, former Mayor of Des Moines, Iowa: "VISTA Volunteers are fellow citizens who have chosen to devote one year of their lives to the noble cause of helping their fellow man. One of the most effective means of eradicating poverty is through the efforts of individual persons who live and work with the poor."

Hon. Lawrence Mana, San Francisco judge referring to the VISTA bail bond project: "I have served in the criminal courts since its (the VISTA bail bond project) initiation and feel its work has been the greatest advance in the equitable administration of justice that we have experienced in many years."

Mayor Ivan Allen of Atlanta: "Atlanta has been blessed with the help of hundreds of VISTA workers. The program is terrific—a great asset to our city. It should be continued and expanded."

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, no program has been more investigated, maligned, and abused than the "war against poverty" under the Economic Opportunity Act. Few are willing to defend it and the reason is clear: The poor are powerless and unorganized with limited voting power and no money to spend in politics.

Yet in fiscal year 1968, nearly 3 million Americans were lifted out of poverty with OEO playing a major role. Over 8 million persons participated in community action programs. VISTA recruited over 5,000 full-time volunteers whose services were worth tenfold the cost.

OEO established neighborhood health centers where the poor were not degraded to obtain needed medical care. Headstart gave almost 700,000 preschool age youngsters new attitudes, values, and habits in learning. Over 96,500 of the most disadvantaged persons obtained education, work experience, and vocational training.

These benefits together with legal services, emergency food and medical help, and senior citizens' programs, have created in the poor a new hope in life and a renewed faith in our system which if now destroyed by politically-motivated amendments to this act can precipitate the gravest crisis in our Nation since 1929.

For, in spite of the success of OEO despite criticism, weaknesses, and underfunding, or perhaps because of its success, there are those who are anxious to destroy the one agency in the Federal Government which has exclusive commitment to the problems of poor people.

It is the very nature of antipoverty programs to be abrasive and controversial. There is no other way of helping people out of poverty than by arousing in them a feeling of dignity and involving them in the resolution of their own problems. Defenders of the status quo are therefore necessarily challenged and the fears of those who represented special interests aroused.

The sponsors of the substitute profess to be helping the poor yet their very first amendment reduces the money authorized by \$295 million in this fiscal year and twice this amount in 1971. At the same time, several new programs are authorized and a new set of bureaucrats added to further complicate administration and add at least \$50 million to overhead costs before the poor get anything.

At the same time this boondoggle with antipoverty funds is authorized sponsors of the amendments propose to "help the poor" by cutting back by over 75,000 the number of children served by Headstart—which currently serves only about 10 percent of the preschool children in need.

The amendments also reduce the number of children in Follow Through by 62,000 thereby depriving this number of Headstart children of the gains obtained in the earlier program.

Further, the substitute reduces the authorized money to support training, career advancement, and jobs under the new careers and operation mainstream programs which the Congress itself created.

But perhaps the cruelest delusion of all about the Ayres substitute is its reduction in support for emergency food and medical aid for America's 15 million victims of hunger and malnutrition by \$75 million to a pittance emergency program of only \$17 million.

It appears some find it easier to send planes to China and spaceships to the moon than food and emergency attention to starving American children at home.

There is nothing more shocking to Americans and more sensitive to their conscience than the ugly fact of starvation and lack of the simplest form of emergency medical attention for millions of our citizens. It is a story of children born with damaged brains, of anemic bodies with sunken eyes and broomstick arms, of families eating from garbage cans, and without running water. It is a medical list generally not reportable to health authorities of rickets, hookworms, deformities, tooth decay, and simple malnutrition—what a price to pay for "political accommodation."

If the sponsors of these amendments are "helping the poor" it is about as helpful as assisting a blind person halfway across a crowded intersection, and there leaving him between the Mack truck and a Greyhound bus.

Are the States seeking control of this

program? In testifying before the House Education and Labor Committee this year James Martin, representing the National Governors' Conference admitted that no new legislation was required to obtain the kind of participation desired by the States. He then cited 15 instances for an effective State role in the existing law. These 15 examples of State involvement in the existing law were then listed as follows:

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967 AND SPECIFIC REFERENCES TO THE ROLE OF THE STATES

TITLE I—JOB CORPS AND WORK TRAINING

Part A—Job Corps (\$295 million)

Section 107: States may establish and operate Job Corps Centers.

Section 113(b): Experimental, research or demonstration projects.—These projects developed only after "appropriate consultation with state agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects."

OEO Director may waive any provision of Title I (Job Corps) which he finds would prevent the carrying out the experimental, research or demonstration projects.

Section 113(c): Director may enter into agreements with state educational agencies to establish and operate model community vocational education schools and skill centers.

Section 115: Participation of the States.—Job Corps Director is required to facilitate state participation in all aspects of Job Corps Programs, including grants for state operated programs and approval by the Governor of all Job Corps Programs in his state.

Part B—Work and training programs (\$476 million)

Section 129: Role of the States.—Grants to state agencies for the provision of technical assistance and training services, especially in rural areas. Grants for the coordination of related state activities and grants for the operation of state work and training programs where a community action agency does not exist.

Part D—Special impact programs (\$60 million)

Section 151: Public agencies, including states, are eligible agencies.

TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

Part A

Section 210—Community Action Agencies.—States and multi-jurisdictional substate regions are eligible agencies. However, agencies must have community based programs and provide for participation of the poor on the Community Action Board.

Section 222(4)—Comprehensive Health Services.—Director must consult with state health agencies in establishing this program.

Section 231—State Agency Assistance.—Broad range of grants to state agencies for the coordination of related state activities and the provision of technical assistance services to local community action agencies.

Section 233—Evaluation of Community Action Agencies.—Director shall consult with state agencies for jointly sponsored objective evaluation of community action agency programs.

Section 242—Conditional Governor's Veto.—All programs and projects under Title II must be submitted to the Governor for approval. Governors are given thirty days to disapprove of the project. An appeal may be made to the OEO Director.

TITLE III—RURAL AREA PROGRAMS

Part B—Migrants and other seasonally employed (\$27 million)

Section 312.—Director may make grants to states for multi-purpose programs to assist migrants and seasonal farmworkers.

TITLE VI

Section 632—Economic Opportunity Council.—The Executive Director of the Council is required to carry out a continuing evaluation of all aspects of the Economic Opportunity Act, including consultation with state agencies especially with regard to the identification and solution of interagency and intergovernmental coordination problems.

Section 635—Information Center.—Director may make grants to the states to establish information service centers and conduct research in cooperation with the states on information system development.

TITLE VIII—VISTA

Section 810.—Authorizes Governors to terminate VISTA assignments on thirty days notice.

Of even more significance are these conclusions drawn from interviews with State officials and included in testimony of Mr. Martin before a committee in the other House, especially numbers 5, 6, and 10.

YANKELOVICH REPORT

(Conclusions Drawn From Interviews With State Officials)

STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF SECTIONS 210 AND 211 OF THE 1967 AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AS REQUIRED UNDER SECTION 233(C) OF THE AMENDMENTS—VOLUME II:¹ DETAILED FINDINGS—FEBRUARY 1969

Conclusions

In summary, these conclusions may be drawn from the interviews with state officials:

1. States initially saw the possibility in the Green Amendment for designating state agencies as CAAs.

2. The interpretation which grew from OEO's implementation of the Green Amendment effectively diminished the opportunity for states to make such designations.

3. Much of the states' dissatisfaction with OEO resulted from seeing an apparent chance to expand their role foreclosed in what were often considered less than proper or straightforward ways.

4. One-quarter of the states wanted a state agency to take over and run OEO programs on a state-wide basis. They sought to expand the role of the state and improved the administration of the programs.

5. Seventy-four per cent of the states never seriously considered designating a state agency as CAA. The commitment to local initiative was strong in these states.

6. Most of the officials expressed a preference for a larger role for the states in OEO operations, particularly more consultation and cooperation with regional OEO offices. The state directors called for greater state authority in allocating resources and supervising programs in the states. But no state felt it could assume greater responsibility for the support of antipoverty work.

7. Slightly over half the states found OEO's instructions, information, materials and assistance in conforming to the Amendment complete and helpful. The remaining states felt these qualities were lacking.

8. Most states felt either that the Green Amendment had had small effect or positive effects.

9. The states had not played a large or a vital role in OEO operations before the Green Amendment was passed; this is unlikely to change under OEO's interpretation of the Amendment.

10. While most states are satisfied with OEO's performance, dissatisfaction and resentment exists in a minority (1/4) of the states. The differences in state and OEO interpretations of the Green Amendment heightened these feelings.

Whether or not they reflect accurately the

¹ Total report consists of three volumes.

facts of the case or the attitudes of OEO, these unhappy attitudes are quite real to the state officials who expressed them. An aura of bad feeling for OEO, and particularly for OEO regional offices, exists in at least a quarter of the state houses. Such attitudes may be sufficiently strong and widespread to challenge the long-range chances for the success of intergovernmental programs like OEO. The states expressed considerable jealousy for their prerogatives and were most offended by what they considered OEO's failure to observe the appropriate protocols and OEO's disinclination to include them as influential partners in the structure of OEO.

The power of the States or of local governments to deal with the problems of the poor is in no way involved. Certainly we cannot deny the States or their political subdivisions the right to have a plan of their own and no legislation is necessary to give them such right. Stripped of political trappings the issue is money. Should the Federal Government become a tax collector for the States? That is the issue created by the proposed amendments, which subordinate the welfare of the poor to this central question.

It would appear, therefore, that the Ayres amendments are not supported either by a majority of the States or any of the poor. The counties are not supporting them and the cities are definitely opposed. The Director of OEO, Donald Rumsfeld, supports a simple extension; and President Nixon supports the Director.

The other body of Congress has passed a simple extension bill and the committee of this House has recommended similar action. That leaves us with a proposal the authorship of which is in doubt, the provisions of which have never been considered in a committee hearing, and the purposes of which are based on unverified allegations and personal gripes. No substitute has ever been presented to this Congress with worse credentials, and if it had come from an outsider it might easily have been referred to the Internal Security Committee.

And there is where it might better rest.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ESCH. I know that the gentleman and I share a deep concern over the areas mentioned in regard to the children and to the food assistance program. I hope the gentleman will during the course of the legislative debate offer amendments not only to the regular bill but to the substitute and I will state to the gentleman that I shall be very happy to support him in trying to increase those authorizations in the substitute.

Mr. HAWKINS. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman and I assure him that if he votes for the committee bill he will be voting to provide \$75 million for this program and it would be unnecessary then to submit any additional amendments.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished gentle-

man from California on the very fine statement which he has made and I should like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the committee bill (H.R. 12321) in order to continue the war on poverty.

I favor the extension of the Office of Economic Opportunity Act that was requested by the administration and improved by the committee. I know that there are many Members who do not feel that OEO has effectively met the demands of our Nation's poor. Each of us, I suppose, can point out instances where the goals of OEO have been abused or poorly administered. But even these short falls do not overshadow the fact that OEO has become a rallying point for the Nation's efforts to combat poverty. It is for this reason that I support the extension of OEO for 2 years. We should be willing to give the new Director and our former colleague Donald Rumsfeld the time to get OEO functioning effectively. This is what H.R. 12321, as reported by the House Education and Labor Committee, does. It gives the Director the authority to move and correct the proclaimed defects of OEO. May I say, I am disappointed that President Nixon has not been more forceful in supporting his own legislation for a simple 2-year extension. The President seems more interested in working for a watered down Voting Rights Act.

The committee will be faced with an amendment that will be offered which will change the entire thrust of the OEO effort. The Ayers-Quie-Green amendment, as I view it, would make the entire OEO effort little more than bloc grants to States and thereby subject the entire program to State control. This I view with alarm because many States have not been very sensitive to the problems related to poverty. We all know who they are.

I realize the supporters of the Green-Quie amendments will argue that the creation of the new State economic opportunity councils, which are to approve all OEO applications, can be controlled by the Director of OEO. But this argument falls on its face when one realizes that the Director must approve or reject the State poverty program in toto. In addition, these new State economic opportunity offices will have the authority to reject OEO applications and are only checked with the limited provision that the Director can override a rejection if he finds "disapproval of such an application would seriously weaken the overall program of a community action agency." Even with this limited caveat, the OEO programs would become, in effect, a bloc grant to States.

This action would serve to subvert the goals for which OEO was established. OEO would no longer be a Federal program that would develop new approaches to combat poverty; instead it would become a State program. We all know that many States have not been very aggressive in moving against poverty, and now this amendment would give the State the authority to control the poverty effort.

The record of OEO has been to some extent experimental as I have stated, but

this program has provided a focus on the major problems of poverty in our country. By accepting the Ayers-Green-Quie substitute, constructive attempts at local poor participation could be eliminated. Also by the institution of a bloc grant approach there is increased danger that OEO might become bound up in the bureaucratic detail that stifles innovation and change that is the mission of OEO.

I should like to announce that I intend to vote against any limitation on the legal services agency. The Murphy amendment that will make the legal services subject to State control, or any other modification of the Murphy amendment, are not constructive means to alleviate the inequities in our political system. I feel that the use of available legal remedies and the passage and implementation of meaningful social legislation can contribute to the goal of the elimination of poverty in our Nation.

This country has the potential to eliminate poverty. I have moved in this direction, for example, by voting to limit many inflated Department of Defense programs. But the issue before us today is the existence of an agency that has been on the cutting edge of the war on poverty. I do not feel that this is the time to move back by emasculating OEO. I feel that we must extend OEO for 2 years, and continue to work to correct its defects.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the committee bill and the rejection of the Ayers-Green-Quie substitute and the Murphy amendment.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, much of what should be said about this measure has already been said. I do not want to plow old ground over and over again, but I shall touch again upon some of the things which have been touched upon and say some additional things.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the substitute which was proposed on December 3 was completely unacceptable, the substitute which was offered by the ranking member of the House Committee on Education and Labor on our side of the aisle and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), and I felt great dismay and deeply concerned about it. We sat down with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) in an attempt to improve it. I think we have been successful. The present substitute is far superior to the original proposal. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN) has gone over this new substitute and has touched upon some of its features. My colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) have gone over it and have made some sound comments with reference thereto.

Research funds will be left in the control of the Director. Under section 251 the Director's control has been improved. Under section 253, the State plan section, the Director has been given authority to set the criteria for State plans. The scope of the State plan has been reduced. The potential uses of the retained 25 per-

cent of funds have been broadened so far as the control of the Director is concerned. Permitting the use of poverty funds to pay claims for attorneys has been drastically reduced.

Mr. Chairman, there are still serious faults in the substitute. Our present plans are to introduce amendments to correct at least two of these. I have reference, first, to the Headstart program and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) has covered this. Secondly, I have reference to the VISTA program. We must not permit this extremely valuable program to be killed by stretching one good program out into a possible 50 poor and inadequate programs. This is one program which should remain a national program. Any alternative will multiply costs and drastically reduce the benefits provided under the program.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I will yield briefly to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I agree specifically with respect to what the gentleman is saying about VISTA, it would indeed be tragic not to keep it as a national program. With respect to the others, I feel differently than the gentleman does, but at least insofar as he is correct in this regard, I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I appreciate the gentleman's support on the VISTA programs.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, in my opinion it is vital that in stripped down and purged and improved form this program with its goal of aid to the needy be continued.

Of course examples can be placed in evidence of waste and error. In any program of this size this will inevitably follow, and wherever we find that waste and error has occurred it should be stopped, it should be cleaned up, and it should be kept from happening again. But there are also a great many examples which could be placed in evidence of the good that has come forth from this program, good to individuals and good to groups of individuals.

Mr. Chairman, when we finish today there are still going to be serious faults in this program, many of which have been left untouched and uncorrected. I hope that early next year the administration will have some further major improvements to offer to this program. I hope that early next year the chairman of our full committee will open hearings on these new proposals.

But when we finish today I earnestly hope that there will not only be these faults, but that we will also still have Headstart, the Job Corps and Special Impact, Followthrough and Upward Bound, Family Planning and Day Care, and the rest; these are in the law at the present time, and they have accomplished a great deal of good. This bill must pass today, and it must be put in condition where it will pass this body, so that that which is good in this poverty program can continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to comment on an Office of Economic Opportunity project that operated in my congressional district for a substantial period of time with what appears to be some very unsubstantial results.

I am referring to the so-called Pennsylvania project. Under this project, a grant was made to the U.S. National Student Association to provide for research, studies, analysis, and a final report on the "Development of Student Resources in the State of Pennsylvania for Full Utilization in the War Against Poverty." The effective date of the grant was April 15, 1968, and the effort was suspended on February 13, 1969.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I want to say that my interest centers very vividly on this project because, in the first instance, the Pennsylvania project headquarters were located at 415 South Albemarle Street, York, Pa., my congressional district. In the second instance, some of the activities of the pertinent project focused on a number of colleges in my congressional district, including Dickinson, Shippensburg, Gettysburg, and so forth.

I became interested in this project in the early part of this year when early in April, I communicated with the Office of Economic Opportunity, asking for a report on the Pennsylvania project, premising this request on the taxpayers' interest. Information was difficult to obtain, and the project's operation did not resolve itself into any clear picture until just recently. Through an assemblage of reports received from high-placed Federal offices, I have been able to assemble a picture, and it is not an assuring one. Some of these reports are of a preliminary nature, while others are final. I would like to say that the principal thrust of reporting emanates from the General Accounting Office, with the findings of that office being documented in an official report submitted at my request.

My interest in the Pennsylvania project had genesis through the investigative work of Mr. Harry J. McLaughlin, an accomplished and prominent reporter associated with the Sunday Patriot-News. This newspaper is located in Harrisburg, Pa., and is well-known throughout the State of Pennsylvania. It covers most areas of my congressional district. Mr. McLaughlin had written a number of penetrating articles on the Pennsylvania project which invoked my interest, and I want to take this opportunity to compliment him for his keen interest in the public welfare and for his expert reporting. It is through such thorough reporting that he demonstrated on the Pennsylvania project that a complex government like ours is kept on proper course.

Mr. McLaughlin has visited with our colleague EDITH GREEN, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Student Unrest on Campuses, presenting her with some of his findings and views with respect to the operations of the Pennsylvania project.

Mr. Chairman, I would like—at this point—to insert into the RECORD a series of newspaper articles written by Mr. McLaughlin, articles on the Pennsylvania project that bring the operations of this project out of the shadows and into the light.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, Apr. 13, 1969]

UNITED STATES PROBES "SECRET" STUDENT PROJECT IN STATE, STOPS AID
(By Harry McLaughlin)

YORK.—A federal investigation is under way to determine whether a \$150,000 grant to a state branch of the National Students Assn. has been used to finance unrest on Pennsylvania college campuses instead of to help the poor, it was learned yesterday.

Officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in Washington confirmed that payment has been suspended on the OEO-sponsored research grant in wake of complaints from numerous communities throughout the state.

The grant had been approved last April 30 to enable the NSA to sponsor a "Pennsylvania Project," described as an effort to stimulate college and university students to become active in community action programs to help the poor and disadvantaged.

Now the OEO audit division in Washington wants to know whether the grant might have been used as a dollar base for persons precipitating or participating in student demonstrations for causes having nothing to do with helping the deprived.

Largely unnoticed has been the fact that the "Pennsylvania Project" headquarters are situated at 415 S. Albemarle St., York. The building serves also as a two-apartment residence for an eight-member coed staff, none of them natives of Pennsylvania.

NSA president Robert Powell and Kate Jackson, a program analyst in the OEO research division, confirmed that one of the complaints has been that persons allied with the Pennsylvania Project have been engaging in student demonstrations against college and university administrations about campus policy and curricula.

In York, a spokesman for the Pennsylvania Project said Patsy Parker, its director, was in the Midwest. But Robert Black, spokesman in absence of Miss Parker, denied that the staff has participated in campus demonstrations.

The OEO audit division reported it had "entered the inquiry" into the Pennsylvania Project early in January.

Hugh Ennis, the division's director, said in Washington he had found "some exceptions in vouchers submitted by the NSA for the Pennsylvania program, which will need further evaluation and study."

According to Miss Jackson, the OEO's main reason for ordering suspension of the project was "because the money and project better developed the participating students than it helped the poor and disadvantaged."

The OEO audit division suspended payment on the Pennsylvania Project grant Feb. 12. Powell and Miss Jackson indicated more than \$100,000 had been expended, with between \$40,000 and \$50,000 remaining when the federal brakes were applied.

Black said in York the amount mentioned by Powell and Miss Jackson was "approximately correct."

According to Gerson Green, chief of the OEO's research and demonstration division, the probe of the project headquartered in York was launched last fall.

Powell reported the project staff operated programs at most state universities and colleges, including Penn State, Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, Bucknell, Shippensburg and Juniata, all in Central Pennsylvania.

Powell said the Pennsylvania Project also

was active in Erie, using Gannon College's campus as a base.

"For example," he said, "our staff established a newspaper in the Negro section of the city."

Miss Jackson said the inquiry into NSA's OEO-funded Pennsylvania Project so far as participation in college unrest and demonstrations are concerned "isn't new or a surprise to us."

Moreover, Powell and Miss Jackson said they doubted that the project's staff actually took part in campus demonstrations or that it had initiated them.

Miss Jackson raised a question, too, whether goals of a campus demonstration might have an ultimate bearing on the outcome.

She said she doubted OEO would look unfavorably upon OEO-funded student groups demonstrating against college administrations "if it would benefit poor and disadvantaged persons."

Miss Jackson added:

"I don't think we would approve of NSA-funded students participating in sit-ins or removing deans from offices just to change chemistry or biology courses.

"However, if it brought a change in program or policy for improving conditions for the poor, then I think we wouldn't object strenuously."

The NSA has been frequently in the headlines.

This was particularly true several years ago when its officials confirmed reports that the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was subsidizing the organization annually with as much as \$200,000.

In return, the association admitted, it provided information about alleged Communist activities on college campuses and information collected at international congresses attended by student organizations from Communist countries.

The publicity almost wrecked the association at the time, according to Powell.

As to the Pennsylvania Project, Powell indicated the NSA is in "delicate negotiations with the OEO on retaining the unspent funds from the project grant." But the OEO research director said, "We are working with Mr. Powell in the phasing out of this project."

Sherry Thomas, of the York office, charged project staffers had their telephones "bugged" and were harassed by newspapers and critics.

She did not indicate where the "bugging" and "harassment" had occurred.

According to a project spokesman, the only York resident identified with the project program has been Bruce Martin, a York morning newspaper editor.

The spokesman described him as "a speaker who went to various campuses throughout the state to speak about antipoverty."

Martin is one of the speakers scheduled to address Penn State's student-sponsored "talk-in," along with former boxing champion Cassius Clay and others said to be identified with liberal, conservative and middle-of-the-road organizations.

In Harrisburg, Dr. Frederic Miller, deputy superintendent in the State Department of Public Instruction, said he had never heard of the Pennsylvania Project.

He directed his assistant, Dr. Donald Miller, to find out about it.

The superintendent serves as the department's commissioner of higher education.

The Millers were not alone in not knowing about the Pennsylvania Project.

Capt. Charles McCaffery, head of the York City Police Department's detective bureau, said the first he heard about it was last week when a man identifying himself as an "OEO inspector" inquired about the project's activities.

"Never heard of the project," responded McCaffery.

Local OEO staff officials and other community leaders in York expressed surprise

that their city served as headquarters for the state program.

U.S. Rep. George A. Goodling, of York and the 19th District counties of York, Adams and Cumberland, said the first inquiry to him about the program came from the Sunday Patriot-News.

He said he wants to know more from the OEO about the project.

Commenting on the work of the project, Black said:

"We had our best success at Franklin and Marshall. In Shippensburg, the project staff initiated the 'Student Stress' program."

At Penn State, according to Black, the project accomplished little "because anti-poverty programs were in effect, and we were anxious to locate only in areas where there was little or no action."

In another development, a Penn State organization known as "Young Americans for Freedom," last Friday petitioned the student government to withdraw its membership from NSA.

Approximately 300 colleges and universities are members of NSA.

Powell said in Washington that he feels the NSA has a right to oppose, and to demonstrate if necessary, for administration and curriculum changes.

"After all," he said, "we are a student organization, and we should voice our views on campus problems."

As to the Pennsylvania Project, Powell said, "it didn't get results."

"It was an experiment," he said. "We wanted to research the campuses to determine interest of students in helping the less fortunate. The response wasn't too great."

[From the York (Pa.) Dispatch,
Apr. 16, 1969]

\$154,000 PILOT OEO TASK HERE
TAGGED FAILURE

The National Student Association says its York-based "Pennsylvania Project" grew from the premise that college students really want to help the disadvantaged and underprivileged. Financed by a one-year, \$154,000 research and demonstration grant from the federal Office of Economic Opportunity, the experimental project sought to tap that potential for community service by establishing a network of students on rural commonwealth campuses.

NSA admits now the project failed. Moreover, its basic premise might have been wrong. College students, it was found, seem rather to be interested largely in parochial matters centering on their own lives.

OEO, which administers antipoverty funds, also saw the project as a failure. However, after suspending the project in mid-February, OEO just agreed on Monday to a \$6,000 extension grant allowing the project's youthful staffers to compile a final report by May 22. The original grant was awarded April 15, 1968.

CITED BY RESEARCH FIRM

Despite the bloom of failure, the project was described glowingly by the head of a research firm accorded a major role in it. Oddly, there seems to be ill will between the firm and NSA. The nationwide student organization claims the firm failed to live up to its commitment.

In York, few knew of the Pennsylvania Project. Headquartered at 415 S. Albemarle St., it did not, however, embrace any York campuses among the 21 locations for its activities. Listed at that address are Patsy Parker, whom NSA identified as the project director; Bob Taylor, Steve Finestine, Bob Black and Margaret Hershey, staffers. None has been further identified.

Daniel L. Hall, president of the local antipoverty Community Progress Council, said he knew nothing of the project until a few weeks ago. A trip to Washington Monday proved unenlightening, he said, since OEO

regional officials with whom he conferred told him the Pennsylvania Project was funded by OEO's national office.

CPC staffers, however, learned of the project last fall. Executive Director Henry V. Harman said he and Mrs. Muriel Bessemer, associate director, together with Barbara Haug, field representative for OEO's Mid-Atlantic Region, visited Pennsylvania Project headquarters at that time. However, since the project apparently could not be tied in with the local program, it was not mentioned in any CPC reports, Harman said.

Harman and Mrs. Bessemer said they were disappointed the project did not include cooperation with local community action agencies, such as CPC. They agreed the project had "good potential" in an "excellent basic idea," but they felt it was not as effective as it could have been.

FEDERAL INVESTIGATION

Harman confirmed reports the project was the subject of a federal investigation. He said a representative from OEO's office of inspection inquired of CPC about the project on March 27. The investigator, whom Harman chose not to identify, appeared interested only in whether the project was effective.

Questions of a different sort were posed about 10 days ago in a phone call to city Det. Capt. Charles L. McCaffery. The police official, also a CPC board member, recalls being asked if police might be conducting an investigation of activities at the South Albemarle Street address. McCaffery said he replied "no."

The caller, McCaffery said, claimed he was calling from OEO in Washington, and explained the project had received a \$150,000 grant, but that funds had been stopped as of Feb. 14. The caller, whose name McCaffery said he couldn't recall, said there were psychedelic murals all over the walls in the South Albemarle Street dwelling.

McCaffery said the phoned inquiry was his only link with any "investigation" or for that matter, with the project, itself. "But for all I know," the police official said of the caller, "he could have been Joe Doaks."

OEO, however, denies it had a probe underway at the time of the inquiries here. Richard Fullmer, chief of the investigative unit in OEO's office of inspection, suggested in a phone interview that the recent probe may be the work of "the McClellan committee." Fullmer said "We completed our investigation prior to Feb. 19," at which point the Pennsylvania Project was suspended.

TWO GROUPS AT ODDS

Sen. John L. McClellan (D-Ark.) heads the senate Committee on Government Operations.

NSA, saying it was unaware of any such legislative probe, reported there have been about half a dozen inquiries by congressmen into its Pennsylvania Project. NSA says it considers the inquiries connected with the struggle between itself and another student group, Young Americans for Freedom.

While NSA admittedly professes leftist politics, YAF reportedly is a rightist group and claims support from several congressmen and senators. YAF, according to NSA, is out to strip NSA of college student government affiliates.

NSA describes itself as a confederation of about 385 student governments at colleges across the country. At this point, NSA says it does not consider the YAF threat a serious one.

OTHER GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Besides the Pennsylvania Project, NSA claims it has had several government contracts in recent years. That includes another OEO program, for a tutorial assistance center. Ever since its controversial financial link with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency was exposed early in 1967, NSA says it has stayed out of international affairs, concen-

trating solely on its domestic projects. It maintains a staff of 40 in Washington, along with regional coordinators.

As described by OEO and NSA, the modification to extend the Pennsylvania Project provides for salaries and costs for a month for seven project staffers who will move to Washington, D.C., to compile the final report. At last count, NSA said it had eight persons on its Pennsylvania Project staff.

Meanwhile, NSA will turn back to OEO \$40,000 in unexpended funds from the original grant, along with \$10,000 it has withheld from the project's research firm, Urban Systems, Inc., of Washington. The firm says it has received only \$40,000 of its \$50,000 share of the original project grant.

At the same time, OEO took over dealings with Urban Systems, at the request of NSA, which said it wanted nothing more to do with the firm. Until now, Urban Systems was linked by contract only to NSA.

The extension, according to NSA, followed weeks of "delicate negotiations." But OEO said it was routine for a final report to be compiled when a project terminates.

CLAIM DIFFICULT ROLE

While NSA claims it has been left "holding the bag" for explaining to OEO what became of the money given to Urban Systems when the firm filed none of its commitments, Urban Systems President Jack Huffner countered that the play-by-ear-type rendered the research function a difficult role.

OEO's suspension of the project, Huffner said, interrupted a review by OEO of the operation, which, if completed, would have led to preparation by Urban Systems of a research plan. The OEO suspension, of course, ruled out a research plan, Huffner said.

He was reluctant, however, to reply specifically to NSA's charge. When interviewed by phone on Tuesday afternoon, Huffner said he was unaware of the month-long extension by OEO of the project.

Urban System's role in the Pennsylvania Project, Huffner explained, was to determine what data would be needed to evaluate the project, then to compile a plan to secure that data.

"We were never able to implement the research we wanted," Huffner said. "We were not able to identify specifically enough what they were going to do. Part of the reason was the very nature of the project, the difficulty of what they were trying to do—organize and develop a network of students on rural college campuses to direct their energies and efforts toward poverty problems; to get white, middle class kids involved in pursuing some of OEO's objectives."

FASCINATING PROJECT

"To their credit, they tried to innovate in this new organization area, but because of this, it became difficult to anticipate what they were going to do next."

"It was a very fascinating, interesting type of project that turned out to be very difficult to control. But that does not detract from the potential significance of it."

While the project failed to set up the network of students, Huffner continued, "I'm not sure there weren't any positive results. But they weren't systematic."

"It should have been a two-year program. They really were innovating—trying things that never were done before. But there were so many time pressures they never really got the operating program defined. If left alone, by now they might have."

Huffner said the project embodied some techniques that might be viewed with shock by uninitiated persons. He referred to "games" NASA had said were used to secure student interest and encourage their involvement.

Huffner used the term "hippies" in describing the project's possible impact on the average citizen.

"The uninitiated would ask 'Why spend money for that?' or, 'Why spend antipoverty money on middle class white kids?'" Huffner said.

Urban Systems was recommended for the research role by OEO, according to both NSA and the firm's president. Huffner added that several others also were suggested to NSA. The student sponsors selected Urban Systems, the only firm it interviewed, Huffner recalled.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, Apr. 20, 1969]

GOODLING SEEKS "ACCOUNTING" OF YORK-BASED OEO PROJECT

(By Harry McLaughlin)

YORK.—The White House has been requested to provide a detailed accounting of \$100,000 expended by the York-based staff of Pennsylvania Project, a state-wide antipoverty program sponsored by the National Students Assn. and financed by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, it was learned yesterday.

U.S. Rep. George A. Goodling of the 19th District (York, Adams and Cumberland counties), said yesterday he wrote to Bryce Harlow, congressional liaison chief for President Nixon, for a full and complete report on the controversial project.

OEO officials, as reported first in last week's Sunday Patriot-News, confirmed they had suspended payment of a \$150,000 research plan to NSA for the Pennsylvania Project because of complaints that the money might have been used to finance unrest on state college campuses. They reported an investigation was underway.

Approximately \$40,000 has been returned by NSA to OEO.

The suspension came last February following an OEO audit division report and after some vouchers had been "red-tagged" for further evaluation and study.

Goodling said he wants to know "how every penny was spent."

The project spokesmen in York said the NSA had attempted to initiate antipoverty programs in campus communities with college students' assistance. He listed Penn State, Shippensburg, Dickinson, Bucknell, Juniata and Franklin and Marshall as among those campuses "worked" in Central Pennsylvania.

At Penn State, Donald Shall, one of three student government presidential candidates, said he met with "Pennsylvania Project" staffers last winter to discuss student reform.

"I especially wanted to hear the views of Miss Patsy Parker, director of the Pennsylvania Project, because she had been president of the student government at the University of Illinois."

"I am for student reform, and I believe Penn State's grading system is unfair and unjust," Shall said.

Miss Parker is among the 100 persons slated to speak at Penn State's "talk-in" on May 23, 24 and 25.

Shall, who represents the Organization for Student Interests, must wait until tomorrow night to learn if he has defeated two other candidates, Ted Thompson and Barry Stein, both independents, for the student government presidency. The election was held last Wednesday and Thursday.

In the meantime, Pennsylvania State University administrators have launched a quiet investigation into the "possible influence of Pennsylvania Project on campus activities," it was learned.

In another development, Dr. Ralph E. Heiges, Shippensburg State College president, reported that the Pennsylvania Project never participated in his college program, "Student Stress," as announced last Sunday by a project spokesman.

Dr. Heiges, in a prepared release, said in

commenting on the Sunday Patriot-News article, "To the best of my knowledge the York office of the National Student Assn. has assisted in no project on this campus. It might be noted that the Student Senate took action on Jan. 28, withdrawing its membership from the NSA."

Dr. Allen Marshall, adviser to the college's Student Stress Committee, confirmed that the chairman of last year's committee, Robert Taylor, is now affiliated with the Pennsylvania Project in York.

The Shippensburg college newspaper, Slate, quoted William Padamonsky, the outgoing Student Stress Committee president, as saying he and others believed the Pennsylvania Project was a front organization for other activities.

Padamonsky added, "This became a factor which influenced Shippensburg State College's Student Senate decision to withdraw from the NSA recently."

In Washington, NSA officials now concede the project was a failure, and have directed York-based staffers, all in their early 20s, to return to Washington to complete "phasing out reports." The OEO granted NSA another \$6,000 to pay salaries of the staffers. The deadline is May 22.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, May 18, 1969]

RECORDS "UNAVAILABLE" ON OEO GRANTS TO STATE COLLEGES

(By Harry McLaughlin)

YORK.—Financial records dealing with how eight young employees of National Student Assn. (NSA) spent more than \$100,000 in anti-poverty research funds on 21 Pennsylvania college campuses are unavailable to the public, it was learned yesterday.

Last February, the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) suspended its contract with NSA because the staff of "Pennsylvania Project," with headquarters in York, had failed to stimulate college students to participate in anti-poverty programs.

On Thursday the staff submitted a report of its activities from last May to February to the NSA president, Robert Powell, in Washington, for submission next Friday to OEO officials, including the auditing staff.

Ever since the Sunday Patriot-News exclusively unfolded the story of Pennsylvania Project's activities in the April 13 edition, U.S. Rep. George A. Goodling, of the 19th District of York, Adams and Cumberland counties, said he has been pressing the White House and OEO officials to reveal details of the operation, especially those dealing with expended funds.

The OEO grant to NSA amounted to \$150,000, but the full amount never was paid.

NSA President Powell said his organization's contract mandates that OEO audit the records, but "we aren't obligated to open our books or show vouchers to the public, or news media, and we don't intend to do so."

The NSA had a contract several years ago with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) for its members to report on information secured at international student congresses, which included representatives from Communist nations.

The OEO and NSA confirmed last month that an investigation was underway to determine if the grant was used to finance unrest on the state campuses. They acknowledged receiving such complaints from numerous communities.

However, according to a letter dated May 2, Goodling was informed by Robert Perrin, acting deputy director of OEO, that "at the time the suspension action was initiated (on Feb. 12) a brief field inquiry revealed no information to indicate that campus disorders resulted from activities of the Pennsylvania Project."

Later inquiries were made by OEO field

investigating teams, it was learned, but these results have yet to be announced.

In spot-check telephone calls with OEO and college officials in Erie, Lancaster, Lewisburg, Shippensburg and York, none recalled ever hearing of the project.

At Shippensburg State College, Dr. Ralph E. Heiges, president, reported Pennsylvania Project never participated in his campus anti-poverty programs, but William Padamonsky, outgoing chairman of the college "Student Stress" committee, said the student government withdrew its membership from NSA because of the project activities.

Padamonsky said he and others believed Pennsylvania Project was a "front for other activities." He failed to elaborate.

In Washington, Goodling said he will demand to see the report of Pennsylvania Project expenditures.

"I believe the public should know how this student organization spent \$100,000, who received the money, and in general, be given a thorough accounting of the expended funds, and also, whether it helped to finance campus unrest," Goodling said.

He said further, "I am personally attending to this matter, and if necessary, I will confront the incoming OEO director, my friend, Congressman Rumsfeld, for a full report."

In the meantime, the OEO office revealed the names of colleges and universities which were reportedly included in the project.

They are: Capitol Campus, Harrisburg; York College, Dickinson, Carlisle; Gettysburg, Susquehanna, Selinsgrove; Juniata, Huntingdon; Elizabethtown, Lewisburg; Franklin and Marshall, Lancaster; Shippensburg, Wilson, Chambersburg; Millersville, Gannon, Mercyhurst and Behrends Campus, Penn State University in Erie; Villa Maria, Erie; Edinboro State, Alliance College, Cambridge Springs; Allegheny, Meadville; University of Scranton, and Washington and Jefferson, Washington.

On April 12, Robert Black, a York spokesman for Pennsylvania Project, said his staff enjoyed its "best success at Franklin and Marshall College." He also said the staff was inactive in York. But worked Penn State University, at University Park, for a brief period. Penn State was not listed by the OEO.

"Never heard of the project," Richard Schneider, director of the F&M "Upward Bound" program, said yesterday. At Bucknell, James Soller, retiring president of the student faculty congress said, "they were never known to us." Bucknell campus was the site of a PP state conference.

York College's president, Dr. Ray Miller, said he learned of the project for the first time when he read the Sunday Patriot-News account last month.

"I'm surprised to know that OEO and NSA claim the Pennsylvania Project operated on our campus. I've checked with administration officials, and they are in the dark, too," Dr. Miller said. He added, "I'd like to find out from official sources what they did here."

OEO officials in York said the project staff "had nothing to do with our anti-poverty programs."

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, May 18, 1969]

PENNSYLVANIA PROJECT CREDITED FOR SWITCH IN ROTC AT GANNON

ERIE.—Pennsylvania Project staffers were credited here yesterday with directly influencing Gannon College officials to drop the compulsory Reserve Officer Training Corp (ROTC) program to a voluntary level.

Miss Sandra Hammer, 19-year-old sophomore at Gannon, said Robert Taylor and Steven Finestein, of the project staff, "de-

serve the credit for changing college policy relative to the ROTC program."

Miss Hammer, who said she was one of nearly 100 students from Gannon and other nearby colleges, Mercyhurst, Villa Maria and Behrends Campus of Penn State University, who assisted in helping the Pennsylvania Project.

"I was an active member in the project," Miss Hammer volunteered. She is also the secretary for Dr. Charles Lundy, a college administrator, and Fred Thompson, director of the college's "Upward Bound" program.

The Pennsylvania Project staffers made their initial contact at Gannon during Orientation Week last fall, Miss Hammer said, and they also helped with the formation of the college's student-sponsored "Colloquy."

"Taylor and Finestein later were joined by two other staffers, Miss Patsy Parker, the chairman, and Robert Black, in arranging for a 'Sensitivity Week' for development of a better understanding between blacks and whites. We had a 'Black Festival.' The staffers helped us secure speakers for the events," Miss Hammer said.

Also, Pennsylvania Project published a newspaper, "The Paper Bag," she said. "It was published at Juniata College and distributed to numerous campuses throughout the state."

At Gannon, she added, "we also published a newspaper called 'The Last Page' and distributed it throughout the campus and the community of Erie."

Miss Hammer said the Pennsylvania Project staffers either stayed at campus dormitories, the Student Union, or at local motels during their visits to Erie.

At the moment, the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) is preparing to audit the project financial records. The project came to a halt in February at the request of OEO, which had given a \$150,000 research grant to the National Student Assn. (NSA) to have Pennsylvania Project staffers attempt to stimulate college campus students to participate in local anti-poverty programs.

When the program was suspended, the staffers already had expended \$100,000, according to OEO officials.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, May 18, 1969]

NADER WILL SPEAK AT PENN STATE UNIVERSITY "COLLOQUY"

(By Harry McLaughlin)

UNIVERSITY PARK.—A group of 15 to 20 Pennsylvania State University students believe that rational dialogue as opposed to physical violence is the solution for avoiding tensions on college campuses.

That point they hope to prove this week with "Colloquy," an educational experiment openly endorsed by the university president, Dr. Eric A. Walker, and numerous campus organizations with divergent political ideas and philosophies.

So far, at least by comparison, the 20,000-student campus has been relatively quiet. It hasn't been entirely without incident, however.

Last week, students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the rival conservative group, the Young Americans for Freedom (YAFF), took mild legal jibes at each other when U.S. Navy recruits sought campus prospects. There were two or three fistfights over the matter. Last February, a seven-hour sit-in ended quietly and without serious difficulties.

The "Colloquy" students have arranged an ambitious program which opens Tuesday with a speech by the safety promoter, Ralph Nader. Then on Friday, it will be Cassius Clay, the former heavyweight boxing champion and black activist, and on Saturday, Al Capp, the "Lil' Abner" cartoonist, at the podium.

Clay, who prefers to be known as Mu-

hammad Ali, is to represent the liberals; Capp, the conservatives.

From Friday through Sunday, another 80 or more speakers will participate in panel discussions on subjects including sexual freedom, student use of narcotics, influence of the news media, black people, politics, the draft, student unrest, rightists and leftists, religion, higher education, the cold war, pollution and obscenity.

The panelists represent extreme liberal and conservative organizations, including such controversial organizations as the Ku Klux Klan, Muslim Student Assn., Young Socialist Alliance, All-American Conference to Combat Communism, the Philadelphia Draft Resistance Movement, National Student Assn., American Civil Liberties Union, the Environmental Defense group, and the Homosexual Law Reform Society.

Among government officials will be William Sennett, the state attorney general, and several state senators.

President Walker endorsed the "Colloquy" and said that "Students should try to add to their educational experiences at every opportunity on their own, through the interplay of various ideas, outside the classroom."

"It is a return to the great tradition" the president remarked, "of listening to various opinions, discussing with an open mind, and weighing the facts."

Larry Rubenstein, Jerry Jablonski and Donald Shall are the student leaders.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, June 1, 1969]

GOODLING AFTER NSA TO RETURN \$100,000 (By Harry McLaughlin)

The United States Dept. of Justice will be asked to investigate the National Students Assn. (NSA) anti-poverty program on Pennsylvania college and university campuses if the association doesn't return \$100,000 in federal funds, U.S. Rep. George A. Goodling, of the 19th District of York, Adams and Cumberland counties, said last night.

The congressman said he is referring to the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity's (OEO) grant of \$150,000 to NSA for the purpose of encouraging college students to participate in off-campus anti-poverty projects. Last February, OEO suspended the program after NSA had spent \$100,000 of the grant because it said the project staff failed to achieve its goals.

Goodling said he was concerned because the NSA activity, named "Pennsylvania Project," was directed "more into the mind-molding and social stimulating areas rather than anti-poverty, and the activities had a heavy hippie flavor."

The congressman said he drew his conclusions after reading a copy of the "Pennsylvania Project" newspaper, "Paper Bag," which advertised that NSA could provide reliable draft counseling and said the OEO-sponsored staff is "a group of people that wants a revolution in people's heads," and is interested in white racism, social rules and regulations, education reform, community action and non-talking games.

In a by-lined article, entitled "The Real Inauguration," Sherry Thomas, of the "Pennsylvania Project" staff, wrote in "Paper Bag" about the experiences of "Yippies being beaten and arrested" at the presidential inauguration parade.

"Some, seeking purpose and a return to action, go to state their feelings to our new rulers, and to be beaten and arrested. Many of us don't see that as we drift back to borrowed homes," Miss Thomas wrote.

She also described the earlier Pentagon and Chicago riots, and then criticized the news media for their coverage of the inaugural parade disorders.

"The communion of the afternoon and night is unfelt by those who describe us to the world," Miss Thomas said in an article.

The names of Miss Thomas and 17 others are listed as salaried members of "Pennsylvania Project," according to a report of a preliminary audit of the project released Tuesday by OEO to Goodling. Six additional persons, the report said, received fees as consultants, including Michael Ross, of 104 W. Pomfret St., Carlisle, who got \$85, for undescribed services.

Another area man, John Uhrich, of 827 Church St., Lebanon, was paid \$1,731 as a salaried staff member.

Miss Thomas, who received \$1,238, is one of four "Pennsylvania Project" staffers listed in the masthead of "Paper Bag." The others and their salaries, are Miss Patsy Parker, project director, \$4,305; Margaret Hershey, \$4,305, and James Miller, Jr., \$508.

The report showed that Misses Parker, Thomas and Hershey, along with Miller, Robert N. Black, Thomas Brackbank, Drucilla Hammell and Robert Taylor resided at 415 S. Albemarle St., York. The house also served as the project state headquarters.

Black was paid \$2,100; Brackbank, \$430; Miss Hammell, \$1,008; and Taylor, \$3,906.

Taylor is a graduate of Shippensburg State College and was chairman of the college's "Student Stress" committee two years ago.

Other staffers, and their salaries, the OEO said, are: Pamela Dickson, Washington, \$430; Donald Diven, Sharon, \$500; Stephen Finestein, Philadelphia, \$3,226; Douglas Glasser, Fortuna, Calif., \$1,154; Beverly Pettiford, Washington, \$1,170; J. Walton Senterfitt, Washington, \$2,154; Mary Tilton, Houston, Tex., \$208; Michael Vozick, Washington, \$310; and Richard Yoder, Somerville, Mass., \$1,250.

Yoder and Glass also collected another \$250 and \$180, respectively, as consultants.

Other consultants, and their fees, are: David Durand, Davis, Calif., \$200; Richard Baker, Chapel Hill, \$6 and Mickey Issacoff, Philadelphia, \$180.

The report failed to explain what the consultants performed in services for the project.

Goodling noted that the preliminary audit showed that fees and salaries totaled slightly more than \$30,000, but the accounting doesn't explain how the remaining \$70,000-plus was spent.

He urged the OEO to make a "saturated audit" of the NSA vouchers and books rather than the routine spot-check audit.

The OEO grant to NSA was \$150,996, but \$100,000 was spent before OEO suspended the contract.

Among the complaints, according to OEO and NSA officials, filed against the project staffers and allied participants was that they encouraged student unrest on college campuses.

At Gannon College, Erie, the project staffers were credited by Sandy Hammers, an administration secretary and a sophomore, with successfully crusading against the college officials in a campaign to have the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program reduced from a compulsory level to a voluntary one.

Officials both OEO and NSA said the "Pennsylvania Project" staff failed to get college and university students interested in anti-poverty programs and became active in unrelated programs as outlined in the OEO-NSA grant contract. So far, the unrelated programs haven't been described.

Goodling, in personal meetings and in correspondence, has pressed for a detailed report of the staff's activities and an accounting of the funds. The representative said he has been in contact with the White House, the OEO, and added, "if I am dissatisfied that the money was misspent, and NSA fails to return the \$100,000 to the taxpayers, then I shall ask the Justice Dept. to intervene in the matter."

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, July 6, 1969]

PRINTER SAYS OEO OWES HIM \$318

(By Harry McLaughlin)

The owner of a Lewisburg printing company is waiting for "Pennsylvania Project" (PP), the defunct college-student operated anti-poverty program financed by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to pay a bill of \$318 for publication of the controversial newspaper, "The Paper Bag," it was learned last night.

Art Miller, owner of Focht Printing Co., confirmed that he had a contract with the PP staff for publication of two editions of "The Paper Bag," which had been distributed to most state college and university campuses.

In Washington, OEO officials reported that they understand the National Student Assn. (NSA) has assumed obligation for the printing bill although the printing work was contracted by the OEO-financed staffers.

The OEO last February suspended its program with NSA, which already had spent \$100,000 of the allocated \$150,000 federal funds for a research and development experiment to encourage state college students to participate in anti-poverty projects.

Some allegations, according to NSA, OEO, and more recently, U.S. Rep. Edith Green, of the House sub-committee investigating campus unrest, were filed that the "Pennsylvania Project" staffers and unpaid co-workers initiated or supported campus projects unrelated to the anti-poverty program. The question also was raised whether federal funds indirectly were used to promote student unrest on campuses.

OEO officials reported that the federal government also had three other contracts with NSA in the "field of anti-poverty" work that totaled nearly one-half million dollars. NSA, which represents 400 college and university student governments, had contracts several years ago with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

Also, U.S. Rep. George A. Goodling, representing York, Adams and Cumberland counties, asked OEO for a full report on the PP audit and an accounting of its work in the state. Approximately 15 young men and women, in their early twenties, received salaries ranging from \$1,000 to \$7,000.

They operated from a York headquarters. The OEO allocated an additional \$6,000 for NSA and the PP staffers to write a report of their activities and only yesterday a copy of the 100-page document was released to the news media. Goodling said he received a copy of the report, but was requested by OEO officials to withhold immediate disclosure.

In Washington, an OEO official said he was unable to determine immediately whether the Lewisburg printing bill appears with other expense vouchers undergoing a "saturated audit" by the U.S. Defense Contract Audit Agency.

Miller said he was told last February by a "Bob Black, of the Pennsylvania Project staff that his organization was in financial distress, and the bill would be paid by the National Student Assn." He said the work was contracted last year by a Fran Murray, another PP staffer.

"I was told to bill the two printing jobs to 'Pennsylvania Project,' and I was in contact several times by telephone with their staffers at their York headquarters. I haven't been paid, and I already paid the \$18 sales tax, so I plan to contact my congressman, Herman Schneebeli, to ask the OEO to get my money. It was an OEO-financed project, let them pay the bill," Miller said.

The printer, who is a school board member in Lewisburg, said he received severe rebuffs from residents for printing the two newspapers because of the "critical articles

appearing in them." The newspapers were distributed at the Lewisburg schools.

One article, by-lined by Martha Hershey, also a paid PP staffer, described how she and other demonstrators were ill-treated by Washington police during President Nixon's inaugural parade. The headline reads, "The Real Inauguration." At the time of publication, she was still in the employ of the OEO-NSA project and receiving federal funds.

Another article dealt with drugs and narcotics, and notes increased arrests in Pennsylvania cities for users. It suggested that students can secure advice on the matter from NSA headquarters in Washington or in York.

The newspaper is now published by the Pennsylvania Assn. of College Students (PAOCS).

The NSA report to OEO describes the "conception" of the project, and said that PP operated on 80 state campuses, although it lists activities only on approximately 20, including Penn State University and other South-Central Pennsylvania colleges and universities.

Although the PP staffers were credited by students at Gannon College, of Erie, with successfully demonstrating for reduction of the college's compulsory Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program to a voluntary elective, the report excludes this activity.

The report indicates that PP played major roles in the establishment of the "colloquies," a campus project to develop dialogue between students, administrators, and the public on key local, national and international problems.

The staffers take credit for helping to make arrangements for "colloquies" at Pennsylvania State University, Gannon College, and in cooperating with the "colloquy" originator, Edward Fitts, of Hanover, at Bucknell University.

Fitts also assisted the staffers in "writing 'The Paper Bag,'" according to the Lewisburg printer.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, July 1969]

OEO REPORT DETAILS PROJECT'S ACTIVITIES

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) yesterday released a 100-page report of the activities of "Pennsylvania Project," (PP) a \$150,000 program it contracted with the National Student Assn. for an anti-poverty experiment on the state's college campuses.

Last February, after the PP staffers expended \$100,000 of the federal government-sponsored project, it was suspended because "the staff wasn't fulfilling the goals of the project." The PP books are being audited.

The report showed PP participated in or originated following programs on South-Central College and university campuses:

Elizabethtown—Initiated and developed a deprivation-discrimination conference at the college to sensitize the students to damaging effects of poverty and racial discriminations incurred by the poor and especially the black poor. Also, consulted with Thrust on way to make coffee house in Harrisburg relate effectively to the poor community, and worked with Afro-American Week committees.

Shippensburg—Initiated student and faculty participation in a community workshop on race relations, and initiated programs against job discrimination and also discrimination in law enforcement in the community surrounding the campus.

Juniata—Stimulated members of Mt. Union and Huntington tutorial projects to form an experimental college for development of community-college relations, and developed program for inter-campus project relationships.

Penn State—Initiated and developed a curriculum plan for community organizing in the College of Human Development, and assisted in planning of its "Colloquy."

Capitol Campus (Middletown)—Consulted with directors of tutorial projects, simulated "new thinking" about role of tutorials in community action program and helped develop or expand programs.

Dickinson—Worked with Carlisle community action groups, initiated program for Dickinson students to participate in poor community, and helped with the educational enrichment program for poor children.

Bucknell—"Although hostility by some student leaders was encountered, "the staff assisted some students in developing and implementing a high risk program. It hosted several state-wide conferences.

Wilson—Consulted with members of "Sam's Gang," a big brother-sister program, and encountered apathy towards a tutorial set-up.

Gettysburg—Encouraged expansion of educational-recreation program for migrant workers.

Susquehanna—Secured participants for state-wide conferences, but also organized a draft counseling group.

F & M.—Initiated publication of a newspaper for Sunnyside poor persons, and assisted "Student War Against Poverty" committee.

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette & Daily,
July 22, 1969]

"DRAMATIC" RESULTS CLAIMED BY GROUP FOR PENNSYLVANIA PROJECT TERMINATED BY OEO

A recently released "final report" on the York-based Pennsylvania Project claims "dramatic" results despite premature termination of the \$150,996 grant by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) because, a spokesman said, "we didn't have enough to show."

The report was submitted to OEO by the United States National Student Association (NSA), which was granted a "small allocation" for its preparation last April, almost three months after the project itself was essentially halted by OEO.

The grant was made April 30, 1968, with the overall directive to explore possibilities and develop effective partnership between Pennsylvania college students and local community groups in the "War on Poverty."

It was terminated, Edward O'Hara, head of the community action program for OEO said in April, "because we didn't have enough to show—they spent plenty of time relating to other students, drumming up interest, but on an informal basis."

The funding included appropriation for data processing, contracted to a Washington, D.C., firm, amounting to about \$50,000.

O'Hara estimated that the project, which had its headquarters on South Albemarle street, but did not carry out any of its campus or community work in York, spent about \$7,000 or \$8,000 a month.

The report, prepared by NSA and the project staff, states that despite vague directives and interfering actions by OEO, "given the fundamental resistance and apathy discovered by the project to exist in the communities and campuses involved, it is believed that the results of this effort have been dramatic."

"Apathy, hostility, suspicion and disinterest," the report summary continues, "have often been replaced by enthusiasm, concern and action."

Their experience, staff members claimed gives a "model providing visible, measurable examples of new means of organizing and stimulating potentially effective but presently inactive poverty workers from among rural or conservative area campus students, and involving them in community action with equally apathetic and resistant but po-

tentially active contiguous poverty community groups."

Heretofore, the report says, most college students involved in fighting poverty have come from the "relatively sophisticated colleges clustered in urban areas."

The project efforts were primarily concentrated in rural communities and on "small, rural, private and relatively isolated campuses," where they found in their initial grant-directed period of survey work on existing attitudes and work in student and poverty communities in the state.

"... the overwhelming and deeply engrained attitudes of both college students and the poor community toward student community action was either total apathy or open hostility and often was a combination of both."

"To the extent that students showed any interest outside their own personal problems, their grades, and their social life, this awareness was limited to vague dissatisfaction with dormitory hours, lack of coeducation and similar issues," the report says.

Similarly, the report contends, local poverty communities were generally unaware of the possibility of taking action to improve their lot "and were even less aware of the basic social and economic reasons underlying their status."

ACTIVISTS HOSTILE

"The few activists pressed in these communities demonstrated immediate and open hostility to any contact whatsoever with nearby campus communities, which they considered to be their enemy as representative of the white middle class establishment," the report continues.

The staff reportedly worked with student groups on over 80 campuses, with widely varying degrees and kinds of activity. Where they found contacts existing with the poor community, they said relationships were of "superficial" service-type, although approximately 20 projects were identified as "rather creative and action-oriented."

The staff reported making contact with five local community action agencies—the small number was one of the OEO's objections, O'Hara said—but found "local CAA's (Community action agencies) were frequently regarded as ineffective by leaders of the poor communities."

Furthermore, the staff claimed, "indigenous leadership in those communities did not even know that their county had a CAA."

The project reported that "more successful efforts in building working relationships came from the contacts with indigenous, private organizations in the community," which were "more receptive to the notion of college student involvement in their work than the CAA's contacted."

NEW TECHNIQUES NEEDED

The report contends:

"It is in this context that the organizational methods of the Pennsylvania Project and the progress made in achieving ultimate goals must be viewed. It was clear that new techniques would be necessary. . . . This necessity coincides with the basic concepts of OEO Research and development (R&D) projects," on which, the report quoted from a 1969 fiscal year plan, "purposes of R&D are clearly to experiment with new methods, structures and techniques which will further the poverty reduction efforts of OEO and other public and private institutions."

The report says the staff worked on the assumption that poverty in America "is the result of the structure and behavior of American institutions of power, and is not the result of the action or inactions of the poor themselves."

Therefore, they considered as "nearly fruitless" service-directed programs affording temporary relief services and focused,

instead, on working for "significant institutional changes."

A second basic assumption for their work, the report said, was that students would be effectively and permanently committed to anti-poverty work only after "they themselves had developed an awareness of the kind of powerlessness and frustration felt by the poor in their efforts to change community institutions."

The staff felt that students and poor shared "a point of common interest" in recently developed "feelings of powerlessness and isolation from the centers of decision making."

A number of techniques were used to achieve the goals of education about poverty and involvement in its eradication. These included more or less formal projects, such as colloquies, stimulation of self-awareness by interview-type techniques, and non-verbal sensitivity exercises designed to build "personal and work relationships marked by a high degree of mutual trust and cooperation."

Other methods were simulation and gaming techniques, role playing and the stimulation of "free universities," in which students assume an active role in their own education.

The report details activities at a number of colleges, including Franklin and Marshall, Juniata, Huntingdon, Dickinson, Elizabethtown, Bucknell, Wilson, Susquehanna, Gettysburg, Gannon and Mercyhurst, among others.

The staff claims the project increased contact among students at the various institutions and, that throughout the project sought to transfer activity from staff to local group.

The report concluded that the "present level of commitment and enthusiasm evident in the communities and campuses with which the Project has worked" indicates the possibility of a statewide organization which could support "a continuing and expanding community action program involving college students and the poor."

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Sunday Patriot-News, Aug. 3, 1969]

REPRESENTATIVE GREEN HITS OEO ON FINANCING—U.S. HOUSE PANEL TO PROBE

(By Harry McLaughlin)

The U.S. House of Representatives subcommittee investigating student unrest on college campuses has entered the inquiry into the activities of the youthful staff of "Pennsylvania Project" (PP) a college campus program sponsored by National Students Assn. (NSA) and financed by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), it was revealed yesterday.

The OEO suspended the NSA project in February after nearly 20 PP staffers had already expended \$100,000 on an OEO research grant of \$150,000 to promote interest among Pennsylvanians college and university students in off-campus anti-poverty programs.

On Tuesday, U.S. Representative Edith Green, an Oregon Democrat and chairman of the House subcommittee on student unrest on campuses, discussed the OEO-NSA project with U.S. Representative George A. Goodling, of Loganville, in the presence of this newsmen, in her Washington office.

"I will do a thorough investigation of the project, although I had received preliminary reports from another congressional committee and other sources," Congresswoman Green said. She is a strong critic of the OEO, and recently complained that NSA president, Robert Powell, was less than cooperative in his appearance before her subcommittee to discuss his association's activities.

The veteran member of the House Education and Labor Committee described the anti-poverty organization "as the worst managed agency ever operated in Washington."

She told Goodling, a Republican, "the OEO, I'm afraid, is indirectly helping to finance some of the country's revolutionaries."

The congresswoman was informed by the York-Adams-Cumberland Counties representative that the OEO stopped the Pennsylvania College experiment because "it did an inadequate job, and failed miserably."

The OEO spokesman, Richard Peacock, wrote *The Sunday Patriot-News* in a recent letter that OEO disapproved of non-anti-poverty activities conducted by the Pennsylvania Project staffers, and would disapprove any other such project if the sponsors failed to meet requirements of their contract.

The PP staffers, in a report of their activities that cost \$6,000 to prepare, told of confrontations with law enforcement officials in Shippensburg, of the publication of "Paper Bag," and of other programs related and unrelated to the poverty program.

At Gannon College in Erie, the PP staff is credited by Sandra Hammers, a student who doubles as a secretary for the college administration, with inaugurating and leading the campaign to have the college officials reduce the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program from a compulsory subject to an elective.

The Gannon College president, Monsignor Nash, said he only recently learned of the PP participation in the ROTC movement and confirmed that the ROTC status was changed after protests from some faculty members and students.

In Lewisburg, the *Union County Journal* reported that the city school board and high school administrators were alarmed by the distribution of the "Paper Bag" in their schools, which nearly forced suspension of several students. The PP publication, the administration said, was derogatory to students and stirred dissension within the student body.

Two issues of "Paper Bag," described as an underground newspaper, were printed in Lewisburg by printer Art Miller, of Focht Printing Co.

Miller said he has complained to NSA, OEO, and his congressman, Herman Schneebli, that the Pennsylvania Project staffers never paid a printing bill of \$318 for publication of "Paper Bag." And OEO officials said it won't pay the bill, and a PP spokesman, Robert Black, Miller said, told him earlier that NSA would pay it.

In one issue of "Paper Bag," dated early in February and a few days before OEO suspended PP activities, there appears a PP-staffers byline article criticizing the inauguration parade of President Nixon, and describing the efforts of Washington law enforcement officers to halt Yippee demonstrations.

The PP staff headquarters was at 415 S. Albemarle St., York, until the date of the program suspension.

The PP staff report of 100 pages states that it helped organize the student-sponsored "Colloquy" at Penn State University, and the one at Gannon College.

An audit of expenditures of the \$100,000 project is nearing completion, Representative Goodling said Friday. It is being conducted by the U.S. Defense Dept.

Goodling again reiterated an earlier statement that he will ask for the U.S. Dept. of Justice to make an investigation of the project if OEO and NSA "fail to provide a satisfactory report."

In a preliminary report to Goodling, the OEO said approximately \$37,000 was spent for salaries for the youthful staffers and for consultant fees.

His Oregon colleague said "Americans today face a threat of romantic anarchism which in political terms is best described as neo-fascism and it offers mob violence and intolerance in place of reasoned dis-

course and understanding." She added, "It must be defeated."

Representative Goodling said after his meeting with the student unrest investigating committee chairman that he wanted to determine whether federal funds were used in Pennsylvania to "stir up student unrest on our campuses, and if so, with what degree of success."

OEO reported that PP "worked" only 19 of the state's 119 colleges and universities.

NSA has received between \$1 million and \$1.5 million in federal and foundation grants for various projects since 1966.

[From the *Harrisburg* (Pa.) *Sunday Patriot News*, Oct. 26, 1969]

YORKER, 22, POSTS \$7,000 BAIL—THIRD SUSPECT IN NARCOTICS CASE FACES HEARING IN CHAMBERSBURG

CHAMBERSBURG.—A preliminary hearing for Robert A. Taylor, 22, of York and McClean, Va., will be held in the week of Nov. 10 before Justice of the Peace Allen E. Jennings on a charge of possession of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

Taylor, who formerly resided at 415 S. Albemarle St. in York, surrendered Friday to Shippensburg Police and later was released from Franklin County Jail after posting \$7,000 bail. He was arraigned before Justice of the Peace Virginia Barnhart on the drugs charge. She said yesterday the case was being transferred to JP Jennings.

Another Yorker, Paul J. Krsek, 21, and a Silver Spring, Md., youth, Kenneth Warner, 20, also were arrested after State Police, Shippensburg Police and state narcotics agents raided an apartment at 421 W. King St., Shippensburg, on Oct. 17.

Taylor was a former student at Shippensburg State College and a year ago joined the staff of Pennsylvania Project, an anti-poverty project sponsored by the National Student Assn. and financed with a \$150,000 grant from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Shippensburg Police reported that Taylor refused to give a home address at the time of his booking and that they took the Albemarle address from his vehicle operator's license. This was the same address as the headquarters and residence of the former staff of Pennsylvania Project, which was closed down last April by the OEO after the staff had expended \$100,000.

The OEO began an investigation into the statewide activities of the staff on 27 college and university campuses. The findings of a seven-month audit of the project financial books has yet to be revealed.

U.S. Rep. George A. Goodling, R-19th District, said he has been in continuous contact with the OEO about the investigation and audit.

Taylor was a featured panelist at the Pennsylvania State University colloquy last spring, a dialogue between students and educators and public officials. He appeared on the "Drug Abuse" panel.

Krsek is president of the Student Government of Shippensburg State College, and a former student at Central High School in York.

Krsek was arrested at the apartment in Shippensburg at the time of the raid and later posted \$7,000 bail, pending a preliminary hearing.

Warner, who surrendered to authorities Tuesday, was charged before Jennings and released on \$3,000 bail, pending a preliminary hearing.

If one word were to characterize the operations of the Pennsylvania project, that word would be "mystery." So mysterious were its operations, in fact, that administrators—at colleges where Pennsylvania project activities were in process—were not remotely aware of the

project's presence or its functions. In addition to this, the head of the Community Progress Council of York—the city where the headquarters of the Pennsylvania project were located—knew nothing about the existence or operation of this particular project.

It should also be called to your attention that fear had been evidence in some quarters that the mysterious operations of the Pennsylvania project had not been directed into the area of the poverty stricken but, instead, had been tailored to cause campus unrest.

To further highlight the mysterious nature of this project, I would like to refer to some of the points contained in the official report submitted to me by the General Accounting Office. I would also like to say that the Honorable Donald Rumsfeld, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity will, in due course, have an opportunity to examine and to comment on this report, taking whatever action he deems necessary to correct the reported deficiencies—I have recommended that this report be directed to Mr. Rumsfeld, and the General Accounting Office has consented to transmitting it to his attention.

The following represent extracts from the GAO report:

The grant conditions required a non-Federal contribution of \$7,400 from NSA as its share of the project cost. NSA personnel could not furnish a record to show whether any such contribution had been made.

None of the NSA salary payments were supported by signed and certified time and attendance cards, which are the records usually required by O.E.O. of grantee as a basis for preparing a payroll.

Of about \$51,000 reported to have been expended for direct costs on this project by NSA, costs amounting to about \$39,000—including \$29,000 for salaries—lacked adequate documentation.

A number of charges to the project appeared questionable; for example, trips to Illinois, New York, California, and Florida were charged to the project although the scope of the project work was limited to schools in Pennsylvania.

Expenses identified with some individuals not officially associated with the project were charged against the grant.

NSA made an unauthorized purchase of a used Volkswagen bus, repaired it and purchased tires for it.

There were a number of questionable transactions involving the project director.

As of November 14, 1969, project expenses in the amount of \$6,372—which were recorded in the books of NSA in May, 1969—remained unpaid. The sum of \$5,370 was for consultant fees.

\$2 was spent for repairs to the automobile purchased without authorization.

\$38 was spent for an air flight to Raleigh, North Carolina, by one Richard Baker, whose name does not appear on the payroll register for the Pennsylvania Project.

The sum of \$3,970 was charged to the Pennsylvania Project as consultant fees in May, 1969, and not paid as of November 14, 1969. Additionally, a cashier check was issued by NSA to cover a personal check in the amount of \$760 from Patsy Parker to David Owens for consulting fees, which was subsequently deposited by Joan Brown, a holder in due course, but the check was not honored because of insufficient funds. No record was found of Patsy Parker having reimbursed NSA.

Mr. Chairman, these represent only some of the irregularities that permeate

the report that has been submitted to me officially by the General Accounting Office on the Pennsylvania project. They serve, however, to provide a perspective on how loosely the project was put together and operated.

The aspect of mystery also pervades the selection of personnel that appear on the roster of the NSA to receive money for various services.

For instance, it is revealed from official records that one David Owens was associated with NSA and received the sum of \$4,730 for consultant fees and conference expenses, along with other sums to cover general expenses. Mr. Owens is listed on the NSA records as being an executive director and founder of the United Black Brotherhood, Inc. It is of further interest to note that one David Owens—reported by newspapers to be an executive director and founder of the United Black Brotherhood, Inc.—also has an interesting record in the intelligence division of the Pittsburgh, Pa., Police Department. This record on one David Owens shows as follows:

May 6, 1967: required, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to assume bond not to molest.

November 11, 1967: arrested in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, for inciting a riot, for assault and battery on a police officer, for resisting arrest, and for disorderly conduct. No trial was conducted on these charges.

October 9, 1968: charged in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, with assault with intent to kill, violation of State uniform firearms Act, carrying a deadly weapon, pointing a deadly weapon, resisting arrest, and conspiring to do an unlawful act. He was tried for these charges on November 24, 1968, and he was found guilty on all charges except assault with intent to kill. He has appealed for a new trial and is now out of jail on bond.

In addition to the above, it is reported by various news media that some years ago, David Owens was arrested in Cincinnati, Ohio, for being a.w.o.l., and he was being investigated at that time for other offenses. Furthermore, it is reported that he was on hand during a disorder that took place in Detroit, Mich., early this year, and it is also reported that he was picked up in London, England, by authorities for carrying a firearm.

The disturbing thing is that after this turbulent background, David Owens was selected to take part in a responsible capacity in the Pennsylvania project.

The name of Robert A. Taylor, RD No. 3, Crescent Drive, Shippensburg, Pa., is also listed as one receiving a salary of \$3,906 on the staff of the National Students Association. The Sunday Patriot News—in its issue of October 26, 1969—carried the picture of a man being escorted off to jail by police of Shippensburg, Pa., after the man had turned himself in on a drug charge. The paper reported further that a preliminary hearing for Robert A. Taylor would be held in the week of November 10, 1969, on a charge of possession of narcotics and dangerous drugs, and it then went on to say:

Taylor was a former student of Shippensburg State College and a year ago joined the staff of Pennsylvania Project, an anti-poverty project sponsored by the National Student Association and financed with a \$150,000 grant from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

It should be noted, however, that this occurrence developed after one Robert A. Taylor was no longer a part of the Pennsylvania project. But it is disturbing to realize that men like Mr. Taylor and Mr. Owens were acting to advise our college youths.

Mr. Chairman, I have mixed feelings on whether or not the Office of Economic Opportunity should be continued. My purpose in presenting these facts is to point out that if the Office of Economic Opportunity is extended in any form, every precaution must be taken to make the programs it sponsors responsible ones.

In the first instance, great care must be taken so that competent, reliable, and trustworthy personnel are selected. In the second instance, every effort should be made to see that programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity are efficiently administered and meticulously accounted for. In the final instance, everything must be done to assure that projects sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity specifically obtain the objectives certified in the implementing grant—unless this is done, we will be using hard-earned taxpayer money to promote soft-objective programs like the Pennsylvania project.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, may I ask what the division of the remaining time is?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Ohio that the gentleman from Ohio has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he starts on his dissertation or would he rather yield later?

Mr. QUIE. Let me yield to the gentleman now because I know the gentleman has been waiting patiently to get into this colloquy.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

I will give you another example of one of the situations that has occurred. In a Southern State a kid cannot go to school unless he has shoes. One individual went into one of these family loan purchasing offices where they can borrow up to \$300 without any security and borrowed \$10 to buy shoes for his kid so he could go to school. While he was in the office, he learned of some of the other benefits that the Government affords in this poverty program.

I contend that this is a good program and I want to know whether or not under the amended program the Governor of this Southern State will have the right to declare that this program is undesirable; and if so what can be done about it?

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman, if the program is already in operation in this State, the Governor has already had that opportunity to declare it undesirable and, evidently, he did not—or else if he did, his veto has been overridden.

Therefore, under my language here that we are offering as a substitute, the

Ayres substitute, it would not again come up to the Governor to decide this question whether it would be approved or not approved.

As the gentleman knows, when the money was put into this program, it stayed in it as a revolving fund. So there is nothing to go back to any State agency to continue that program.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. How about additional funds?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman asked earlier about the additional funds.

It is my understanding that there is nothing budgeted for additional funds. But since the original funds came from section 232, the research and pilot programs, undoubtedly additional funds would also have to come from that section. That section is not covered under the State developmental and coordination program. Therefore, any additional funds would have to go the same as the previous request for funds directly from the Director of OEO, or to whoever handles it locally.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Now I have convinced, I think, the head of the Committee on Appropriations that appropriates the funds of the validity of the program and he has promised me that he will do everything that he can to see that money is appropriated for that program.

Will he need enabling legislation or will he just be able to include in the appropriation bill sums to cover this particular program?

Mr. QUIE. I imagine he would still have to get the approval of the Director of the OEO to fund that through section 232, where he received the fund originally.

I think they will need the additional support of the Director of the OEO to receive the money which might be in the appropriation bill.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. But there would have to be no other authorizing legislation needed?

Mr. QUIE. No other authorizing legislation, you are quite right.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. Under the substitute bill, will the Governor of Georgia, Lester Maddox, have the veto power over the poverty program in his State?

Mr. QUIE. He has the veto power now and he will continue to have the veto power.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my statement now, and I will say to the gentleman—of course, I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RALLSBACK) and anybody else who may want me to yield—I shall yield when I have made my statement.

Let me just review a little bit about the substitute.

I imagine under the 5-minute rule there will be brought up all the differences of opinion that anyone might have to title III of the substitute. So I will only refer to that fact that most of the flack will come from title II, the new opportunity for the States to assume administrative responsibility. This is what I felt

in the very beginning that the Economic Opportunity Act has been sorely lacking.

Because in the observations that I have made and in the philosophy of government that I believe in, any domestic program functions best if the State stands between the local community and the Federal Government.

Because in the past political influences of the community on the Federal programs have been such that they have substantially changed them. They stay on target better when there is State administration.

When we are dealing with a program that helps the poor who have been left out of programs in the past, and evidently left out so that they are poor right now—I want to make absolutely certain that if a State assumes additional responsibility, it should be in such a way that it conforms with the act, and that certain individuals and certain categories of people who are poor will not be left out of the program.

I do feel very strongly that we have devised in this title II an opportunity for the State to assume a greater portion of the action in such a way that they must receive the approval of the director before they can set up a developmental and coordination program.

In many States they are ready to move to assume that additional responsibility. They have already indicated, and they have indicated to the Director of the OEO previous to the present Director.

Title II of the substitute lays out structurally the means by which a State can assume additional responsibility.

But, first, the State does not have to do anything different than they do presently if they do not want to. They can leave things the way they are.

But if they have a State economic opportunity office, they should be given some opportunity to work with local communities. The Director already has notified them with a draft of proposed changes and guidelines. He has already indicated that he wants to give 30 percent more money to the States to enable them to do it. So the substitute requires that all applications in that case would have to go through the State office for recommendation on their part to the Director rather than simultaneously, as it is at the present time.

However, one of the biggest handicaps to communities has been the fact that the regional office is so far away from them, and so in many cases without sensitivity to their needs, and they really should have the opportunity, if the State can devise it, to have an administrative unit which will be more sensitive to the needs of the communities of the State and the categories of the poor in the State and to work out such an administrative operation. This is what we have proposed. I am convinced that it will enable the Economic Opportunity Act to function much better than it has in the past. Many of the glaring faults that we have pointed out before we have been unable to do anything about because it is handled by a Federal agency not responsive to the people. I say you have a vehicle at least under the Federal system that many of

us believe strongly in, that the people can actually get at some of these shortcomings and make changes. Therefore, I am convinced that this is the wise step to make at this time. I know many people have said that about the only way you can clean up the OEO is to get rid of it and start over again. We do not have that opportunity right now, because a complete new vehicle to operate under has not been developed. When the act comes up for extension again, perhaps at that time the vehicle will have been developed. At this time it has not been, and we believe we have provided the machinery to improve the administration of OEO with the substitute.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I understand this will be my only opportunity to speak, and I wish to begin by saying—and I am sure the gentleman in the well agrees with me—that we should all commend the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Director Rumsfeld, for the job he has done in providing many innovations, many internal changes designed really to help restructure the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the gentleman that it has not been an easy task for him. I am aware of that. In my own State he is up against tremendous odds.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Because of my high regard for the Director, as the gentleman in the well knows, I am very reluctant to support his substitute despite the fact that I know he has given a great deal of time to it.

I would like to ask some questions in the hope that we can clarify some of the language that I believe will be offered in the gentleman's substitute. I am particularly concerned that all applications, whether under the proposed section 251 or under the proposed section 253, will in fact first go to a State office but then will be referred to the office of the Director of Economic Opportunity. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. I would say that under 251 that is true. All of them end up with the Director. In 253, if an application is approved by the State, then there will be no reason for it to go to the Director. However, every application that is disapproved under 253 would go on to the Director for him to make the determination whether he is going to fund it under the 25 percent that he can reserve.

Mr. RAILSBACK. In other words, if I understand the gentleman correctly, what he is saying is that even under section 253, if the State should disapprove of an application, it would then still be able to go to the Director for the Director's review and possibly an override, and then the Director would be permitted to fund it out of the 25 percent reserve funds provided in the gentleman's substitute?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct. Will the gentleman permit me to yield to his colleague from Illinois, who I believe is together with the gentleman?

Mr. RAILSBACK. Certainly.

Mr. ERLBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, to clarify this point, the gentleman on several other occasions has said that at the time the State developmental and coordination plan goes into effect the State economic opportunity office takes over the function of the regional office of OEO.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. ERLBORN. Is that completely accurate in the light of your comment now that applications that are submitted to the State economic opportunity office and are approved do not go on to the Director of OEO? Does not the Director of OEO at the present time have the final authority to approve or disapprove applications rather than the regional office?

Mr. QUIE. He does have the final authority. It still remains with him. But under section 253 he then reviews and indicates whether he will permit the State to assume that, just as now in the regional office, if there is approval of the plan, there is not a necessity for the regional director to send it down to the Director before they give approval.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLBORN. But to the extent that the approved application does not go on to the Director for final approval but receives the final approval of the State office, there is some power of the Director to take it away and it is intended to be taken away by section 253.

Mr. QUIE. That is right. If the approval of the applications under section 253 is not according to the developmental and coordination program, the Director then can step in and bypass the State.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a last question?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. ERLBORN. At the present time it is the regional office and the Director who determine whether an applicant qualifies as a community action agency, which is a separate function from determining whether the function will be funded.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. ERLBORN. Under section 253 will it be the State Economic Opportunity Office or the Director who determines who is a qualified recipient as a community action agency which conforms to the existing requirements of law?

Mr. QUIE. Section 253 does not change the present law in this regard. Section 253 applies only to the funds under sections 221 and 222.

Mr. ERLBORN. So that the question of whether it is a qualified community action agency is left with the Director.

Mr. QUIE. Left with the Director; yes.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I have a number of questions.

I wonder if I am correct in assuming there is nothing in the substitute to prevent regional offices, although perhaps some of their personnel strength will be shifted to the State offices, from continuing to provide technical assistance

both to a State desiring to formulate a State plan and to a local community action applicant.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct. The authority under different sections, which the Director uses, he can utilize through a regional office, just as other departments of the Government which deal through State plans. They still have regional offices.

Mr. RAILSBACK. They will still have regional offices and these regional offices will still be permitted to monitor and evaluate?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. RAILSBACK. That is true under both sections 251 and 253 of the proposed substitute?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Under section 253 is it the gentleman's understanding that specific grantees that may comprise the State plan or the long-range plan, if they are known at the time the State plan is to be formulated, will be identified to the Director so that he can monitor, instead of just utilizing, say, information on paper? He can review, just as he now can?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I believe that answers most of my questions.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, because I took time away from the gentleman from Iowa, I should like to yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, how much time does remain?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield back the time remaining?

Mr. QUIE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. AYRES. And how much time does the majority have, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. It is 17 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12321, the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969. This is not the first time I have done so, and I hope it is not the last. I hope it is not the last because the problems of the less fortunate are still with us, although not so numerous as when we initiated this program 5 years ago.

Ardent program supporters realize that the gains may not be as great as originally anticipated, while pessimists look upon OEO gains as minimal. But, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the important thing is that there have been gains.

I think it clear we expected too much in the beginning. There were those of us who felt OEO would cure the pent-up domestic problems of our country in a decade. We were wrong. The problems of this country were not created in one decade and they will not be solved in one decade.

Early in our history, the problems of poverty were personal problems. They were dealt with by persons and families and were not considered matters of public concern. Later, kind-hearted individuals, religious and fraternal organizations attempted to alleviate the hardships and suffering of the impoverished.

Still later their plight became a matter of concern of the public. States began programs of providing subsistence for the hungry and shelter for the homeless. Programs for the aged were undertaken by States and counties. I can still recall when I was a very young boy hearing stories and feeling the sorrow of those who were at the county poor farm. During the 1930's the Social Security Act undertook to provide assistance for the very poor through the States.

Today we provide billions in public assistance programs to insure subsistence for the impoverished of this Nation. Periodically, Congress has revised the public assistance features of social security. In the House this legislation is always debated under a closed rule that does not allow us to offer amendments.

But, Mr. Chairman, all the programs, all the charity of which I have spoken is welfare—provision for subsistence. The Economic Opportunity Act does not provide charity; it does not provide a hand-out; rather it provides a helping hand so that the recipient is more able to help himself. Surprisingly, it is a relatively new concept. Regardless of our failure to recognize the validity of this approach, it is clearly effective and, in the long run, a less expensive program than simply providing subsistence.

If, by this legislation, we can provide the training, education, or motivation which moves one from the position of poverty to the position of a taxpaying productive citizen, the basic purpose of the act is fulfilled.

In our attempts to do this we have not always been successful. There have been some failures. Clearly the new concepts and programs have irritated established institutions and persons who generally oppose change. But if the shortcomings of our society are to be corrected, there must be change. The committee legislation for orderly change is an alternative to the revolution and violence of those in our society who contend we are incapable of peaceful and orderly transition.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been a catalyst for the factors, factions, and demands of change. It has provided the impetus and funds for programs which seek to abolish the degradation and despair of poverty. While the goal of this agency should be to work itself out of a job, that goal has not yet been reached. We must allow this program to continue intact. Only one Government agency is concerned exclusively with measures to combat poverty—and this agency is the Office of Economic Opportunity.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct my effort in behalf of three specific programs in this legislation: programs for the American Indians, for migrants, and for legal services.

INDIANS

The 600,000 American Indians are, as a class, perhaps the most impoverished group in our Nation. Average income is \$1,500 per year, 75 percent below the national average. Unemployment is nearly 40 percent—10 times the national average. The dropout rate of Indian schoolchildren is twice the national average. Indian children have achievement levels 2 and 3 years below white children.

Why is this? No one knows exactly, but probably the reasons are almost as numerous as the theories. All of which serves to show that a diversified attack must be mounted if the problems are to be cured.

Last year approximately \$23 million was utilized for different Indian programs under title II of this act. With grants from OEO, Indian tribes across this Nation funded economic development, education, housing, health services, and many other programs. The important thing is that these were programs which the Indians themselves have devised and implemented.

I suppose we all have our favorite theories as to the reasons for the Indians' present plight. Under my theory, benevolent paternalism is the culprit. Operating through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, we have for over a century been telling the Indians what their problems are, how to solve them, and when to solve them. Not so with Indian programs under OEO. For the first time they have had a chance to tell us their problems and suggest solutions, and we are watching with astonishment as they make their programs work.

A typical example is the aquaculture project carried on by the Lummi Indians in my own district. In some respects the Lummi aquaculture project is unique in its approach to the concept of helping a disadvantaged minority group break the "cycle of poverty." The Lummi Indian Tribe, numbering nearly 1,200 people, live on a small reservation immediately west of the city of Bellingham in Washington State. A 5,000-acre tideflat is part of the reservation. There, with the help of a number of Federal and private agencies, the tribe is developing an integrated seafood production facility.

They will grow, harvest, and merchandise seagoing trout, salmon, and oysters. The tideflat, useless in its present form, will produce an estimated \$5 million per year gross income when developed fully. It will provide full- or part-time employment for a minimum of 650 people—the entire tribal work force.

All of this potential is possible within the framework of the Lummi Indians' history, culture, and tribal mores. It is an extension of their millennia-old tradition of extracting their livelihood from the sea. Descendants of the spear and net fishermen of old are now becoming college and laboratory-trained aquaculture technicians, marine biologists, business administrators, seafood merchandisers, and operators and proprietors of a tribally owned corporation. The Federal Government has invested more than one-half million dollars in the project.

It should start showing financial returns next spring and summer.

Equally impressive programs in economic development are taking place on other reservations in this Nation.

The belief has long been held by some that the Indian people are not interested in education. While the education system we have devised for them leaves much to be desired, it is interesting to see some of the education programs the Indians themselves have developed. The doubters ought to attend some of their Headstart and adult basic education programs.

Anyone who has visited many Indian reservations has noticed the sad state of housing. This, like most deep-rooted problems, will not be cured in one generation. Nevertheless, it is impressive to watch the changes taking place on many reservations, because of housing programs operated by the Indians under OEO grants. Married men with families are being enrolled in construction skills courses and are also provided funds for the repair and renovation of their own dwellings—a kind of self-help, on-the-job training. Younger Indians are being trained in the construction trades and then, working with tribally operated construction companies, are building complete, new houses for Indian families.

These are just a few examples of the fresh breezes stirring on the Indian reservations in America. There are many other success stories. There are some stories of failures. But with a long history of failure in our dealings with the Indians, I regard it significant that most all of the successes have occurred under OEO programs in the last 4 years. Perhaps we are learning at last what the Indians have known for years. Success will only come when they are involved in the solution of their own problems.

But there are three areas of great concern for me in this otherwise relatively optimistic picture:

First, is the problem of the "off-reservation" Indians. Away from their friends and relatives, poorly trained, often subject to discrimination, the "off-reservation" Indian faces adversity not known to others. The funds provided under title II of this act are almost entirely provided through tribal organization on reservations. Very little is being done through OEO for the "off-reservation" Indians and small nonreservation tribes. I am pleased to note the funding, for study purposes, in my own State of a small tribes council which could act as a CAP agency for such programs in the entire State. More needs to be done to serve such groups and individuals who are not on reservations.

Second, the funding for Indian programs under title II is not earmarked. Under the former Director of OEO, Indians, in proportion to their numbers and special problems, have received a fair share of the unearmarked funds of that title. I have been assured by the present Director that it is his intent that they continue to receive a proportionate share. For this reason, I shall not propose earmarking. But, in the event there is additional title II earmarking with additional funds, or the present proportion of title

II funds for Indian programs is cut, I shall thereafter insist on statutory earmarking provisions.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, I am disturbed about efforts of some of my colleagues to require title II programs to be State operated. For the American Indians, State control would not serve their best interest. The special obligations of this Nation to Indian people exist by virtue of treaties with the Federal Government. These are national obligations. No single State should be called upon to represent this Nation in its dealings with the Indian people. In addition, some tribal boundaries cross into a number of States. The lines of communication have historically been from the tribes direct to the Federal Government. Placing another level of bureaucracy between the Indians and the Federal Government would, in my judgment, be disastrous to the operation of these programs which now show such excellent potential for freeing the tribes of bureaucratic indecision and inaction.

MIGRANTS

Mr. Chairman, if there is any other group in this country which is beset by worse conditions than the American Indian, it is the migratory farmworker. In 1968 the average family income was \$1,490 and the average education level was 8.6 years. These facts are deplorable enough when taken by themselves, but when one realizes that in 10 years the average migrant's annual income has increased by only \$11, it becomes catastrophic. In 1959, the average migrant income was \$911. Today it is \$922. The story of migrant education is equally appalling. In 1940, the average migrant educational level was 7.6 years; in 1967, 8.6 years. While this Nation has experienced a fantastic acceleration of its educational achievement, the migrant has increased 1 year in the past 27.

We often hear the charge made that "this did not just happen." In this case it did just happen. It happened because no official needed to answer to the migrant. Following the crops, a migrant family often sees 10 to 15 States in a year and three times as many counties. Whose charge is he? What school should serve his children? How can he pay for health services? How can children 7 and 8 years old be in school when their help is needed in the fields?

That the migrant has been an orphan of our system is illustrated starkly by his exclusion from the Social Security Act, unemployment compensation, and the National Labor Relations Act.

And so the sad plight of the migrants today plagues us because we have done almost nothing about it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, prior to OEO migrant programs we in the Federal Government spent more on migratory waterfowl each year than we did on migrant laborers and their families.

But the Economic Opportunity Act changed that. Today, under title III of this legislation, we seek authorization of \$34 million.

Much of this will be utilized as transition money. With the migrant problem we face not only a great responsibility, but a golden opportunity. By 1980, 10

short years, 40 percent of the jobs now filled by migrants will be done by machines. Both our challenge and opportunity is to smooth the road. We must provide special education and job training so that these people can be brought into the permanent labor force.

One alternative is, 10 years from now, to scurry about, wringing our hands, decrying the fact that we have an additional 1 million people who are on public assistance because they are uneducated and untrained.

The other alternative it seems to me, is obvious. We must prevent this future problem. That is what OEO programs are attempting to do. We are providing schooling for the young people and skill training for their parents. We are providing special housing programs which will provide permanent residences for migrant families who are being removed from the migrant system with permanent jobs.

Young children of migrant parents are being taken from locked cars, tiny rooms, and the care of brothers and sisters barely their senior and placed in day-care centers. There they are acquiring the basic education which will later be used to acquire and hold permanent positions.

These programs, Mr. Chairman, are the proverbial ounce of prevention and they must be continued.

LEGAL SERVICES

I should like to present a few observations on the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which is widely admired as one of the most effective OEO programs.

As many will recall, a legal services program was not included in the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It was added in the 1966 amendments, along with Headstart and the comprehensive health services programs. Since that time, legal services has emerged as one of the most viable and visible manifestations of our national commitment to overcome the scourge of poverty.

The statutory mandate of the legal services program provides that it shall: "Further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and providing legal advice, legal representation, counseling, education, and other appropriate services. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assured maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession."

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is useful to keep in mind the language of this mandate as we consider both the successes which legal services has enjoyed and the problems it has encouraged.

The initial obligation of the legal services program is to furnish legal advice and representation to poor people. This mission is being accomplished with striking success. During the last 2 fiscal years, legal services attorneys represented over 1,100,000 persons in 49 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. During the current fiscal year alone, the program expects to serve 800,000 poor people. It is currently fund-

ing 265 legal services projects employing nearly 1,900 full-time attorneys in over 850 neighborhood law offices.

These attorneys furnish representation only in civil matters; they are precluded by statute from representation in criminal matters, except in extraordinary circumstances. Thus, the problems they encounter involve the practices of unscrupulous merchants, loan sharks, landlords, and employers who prey upon the poor. They also involve the conduct of public officials charged with administering the welfare, housing, medical care and related statutes which vitally affect the everyday lives of poor people. For most of these low-income clients, a trip to the neighborhood law office represents their first visit to a lawyer and their first encounter with the law as an ally, not as an adversary, as a positive instrument for resolving their grievances.

The quality of services these clients receive is also striking. During the last year, legal services attorneys have won favorable verdicts for their clients in about 70 percent of their litigated cases and negotiated favorable settlements in another 15 percent. That kind of winning percentage is the clearest possible example of the vigor and competence which the program has displayed. In addition, it has increasingly attracted the brightest and best qualified graduates of the Nation's law schools—young men who not long ago would have gone to work for prestigious law firms and large corporations. Today, one out of every 17 law school graduates, is going to work at great financial sacrifice, in legal services programs around the country. The Congress can take great pride in a program which has directed the energies and talents of so many of our brightest young lawyers to attacking the problems of the Nation's poor.

The statutory mandate under which it operates directs that the legal services program be carried on in a manner consistent with the best traditions of the legal profession. This mandate, too, has been scrupulously implemented.

Each legal services program is locally initiated. Applications for funding are prepared by citizens located in the community to be served by the program. A not-for-profit corporation is established to receive and administer Federal funds. From its inception, the legal services program has required that the board of directors of each of these corporations must be comprised of a majority of licensed attorneys practicing in the community. In this way, the program has encouraged vigorous participation by the organized bar as well as individual citizens in the operation of each legal services project. This local board of directors operates the program establishing plans and priorities, hiring staff, and making financial decisions. The lawyers on the Board are encouraged to insure that the program operates in a thoroughly professional manner.

When the legal services program was first being considered by Congress, the fear was expressed by some members of the bar that it would threaten intrusion of the Federal Government into private practice of law, which has historically

been independent of governmental interference.

However, the bar was persuaded to take the lead in establishment of the legal services program on the basis of firm assurances that it would be operated in the best traditions of the legal profession in this country. A 1967 letter from Jacob Fuchsberg, president of the Roscoe Pound-American Trial Lawyers Foundation, and at that time a member of the National Advisory Committee on Legal Services, expressed the policy of the organized bar at the inception of the program:

If providing counsel were to be meaningful, such counsel must exercise the same high standards of integrity, the independence, dedication and skill in their advocacy of the causes of the poor as was required of them for all other clients. They had to fully reflect the unique professional disciplines that had been developed and are enforced by the organized bar and by our courts as a *sine qua non* of justice under our adversary system.

For such inviolable professional and public policy reasons, under the leadership of the American Bar Association, and with the active participation of the National Bar Association, the National Legal Aid and Defenders' Association and the American Trial Lawyers Association, as well as numerous state and local bar associations, the lawyers of America necessarily joined their offer for full cooperation with the Program with an undertaking of continued responsibility with regard to the standards and guidelines by which it would operate.

The organized bar continues to be an effective and articulate supporter of the legal services program, and has fulfilled its pledge to participate effectively in the formulation and implementation of legal services policy. For their part, the individual legal services attorneys have amply demonstrated their dedication to the professional obligations underlying the role of attorneys in this country. And they have been joined in their efforts by many thousands of private attorneys who have contributed their talents on a volunteer basis to assist legal services attorneys. Almost a half-million hours of volunteer time was recorded by private practitioners during the last fiscal year—the equivalent of about 1,400 full-time staff attorneys.

Consistent with the best traditions of the legal profession, and also pursuant to the broad statutory mandate to "further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty," legal services attorneys have broken much new ground in asserting the interests of their clients. They have taken seriously the admonition of the legal profession's canons of ethics that their clients are entitled to any and every remedy afforded by the laws of the land. They have advanced new arguments, overturned old precedent and challenged unproven assumptions—and as I mentioned, most of the time they have succeeded.

Occasionally they have brought cases against Government agencies and the public officials who administer them. This should not be surprising since hundreds of thousands of poor people rely upon the services furnished by public welfare and housing agencies, to name

just two examples, and arbitrary or unfair conduct by these agencies may have a severe impact upon people who rely on their decisions for the very necessities of life.

Inevitably, some of the cases filed against public agencies are controversial, and provoke the claim from some quarters that Federal funds should not be provided for attorneys to bring suit against other tax-supported agencies. I reject this claim as it has been rejected by the American Bar Association, many responsible citizens, and by public officials too numerous to mention.

In the first place, there is nothing novel about one tax-supported group suing another. Airlines sue the Federal Aviation Administration, railroads sue the Interstate Commerce Commission, shipping companies sue the Federal Maritime Board, and farmers sue the Department of Agriculture. All of these litigants are subsidized by the Federal Government—and in sums far exceeding the budget of the legal services program. If we sanction litigation by these federally supported parties against the Government—and we unquestionably do sanction it—there can be no basis for refusing to extend the same rights to poor people to vindicate their rights and redress their grievances against Government agencies through the use of lawyers financed in part by Federal funds.

Moreover, it seems to me that taxpayers would be first to applaud suits to enjoin unlawful conduct by the public agencies they support, and the first to condemn those who would insulate that conduct from judicial scrutiny. I would venture that there is not a Member of Congress who has not at one time or another witnessed the arbitrary and unfair manner in which bureaucracy can stifle even the most meritorious claim. Can there be a Member who would insulate such bureaucracies from accountability for their errors? I would think not. And the fact that claims are brought by poor people should have no bearing upon this conclusion. Justice is the righting of wrongs; if there is no wrong, the courts will not respond.

The fact that some of these cases are controversial is no basis for criticizing them. I would suggest that courtrooms are clearly the most appropriate forum for such controversies to occupy. Our judicial system has been specifically designed over a period of nearly two centuries for the express purpose of resolving disputes among citizens and solving conflicts within our society. A recent report of the President's National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence—the so-called Eisenhower Commission—reminds us, as if we needed reminding, that failure to provide access to courtrooms, where disputes can be resolved within the legitimate institutions of society, breeds despair and frustration which may ultimately find expression in antisocial and even violent behavior.

The strains and hostilities which poverty engenders are starting to be recognized by society. Often that recognition takes the form of consternation and distaste for those who bring their prob-

lems to our attention, for they do in fact represent the most perplexing dilemma facing our country today. But the problems in fact exist. Legal services did not create them; legal services is simply trying to grapple with them within the framework of our established institutions. So I say to the Members, let us welcome these controversies into the courtrooms and let us applaud the efforts of legal services in channeling conflicts into our judicial system and off our street corners.

A good example of legal services at work is the filing of suits challenging the practice by welfare departments of cutting off benefits without giving a prior hearing to the persons involved. Welfare recipients, by definition, depend upon their monthly welfare check for survival. Any interruption, no matter how short, imposes tremendous hardship on the individual and his family, and if the termination has been made improperly, the injustice is magnified.

A legal services attorney recently represented an 84-year-old woman who was notified by her State department of public assistance that her aid for the aged was being terminated at her request. But she told the agency that she had never requested that her benefits be terminated. She was reinstated 5 weeks later by court order pending the outcome of her suit challenging the constitutionality of cutting off aid without prior hearing.

Another suit involved poor persons on welfare who were forced to buy their food at high prices and at specified stores beyond walking distances from their homes. Evidence showed that the prices at these stores averaged 27 percent higher than at nearby supermarkets. The action was voluntarily dismissed when the city agreed to change its regulations.

Housing codes which legislative bodies around the country have deemed necessary for the protection of human beings, have been notoriously flouted by some unscrupulous landlords. Due to shortages in funds, the codes have been difficult to enforce. In suits brought through legal services programs, the courts have given the codes teeth, previously missing.

The confrontation with legal services, of which I spoke earlier, is the result of its success. Can it be, Mr. Chairman, that its very success will mean its downfall? If we provide no forum of justice for the poor, they will seek another forum—the street. And I think we have seen enough of that.

Some proposals are under consideration which interpose State Governors or agencies between the legal services lawyer and its client. I must oppose all efforts to prevent a legal services' attorney from following his client's case wherever it might lead. Mr. Chairman, if you or I were to hire a lawyer, he would pursue for us every remedy available at law. If limitations are placed on legal services, the poor man's lawyer may be forced to tell his client that the court's door has been closed.

These ill-conceived proposals only give credence to the shouts of dissident youth in our society who say that the

system is so incapable of self-reform that it must be destroyed and built anew.

Are we so frail, so frightened, so unsure of ourselves that we will refuse the poor the means to challenge our institutions within one of the most respected of those institutions—the courts of this land?

Do we choose the streets and ghettos of this Nation as the place for confrontation, or will we decide upon the courts for our meeting place? Surely a mature, secure society will choose the courts.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this discussion of several OEO programs has been helpful in our consideration of the pending bill. The amendments being offered to cripple the Office of Economic Opportunity represent nothing less than a crisis of understanding, a crisis of empathy. To abandon the good works of OEO would be to break a promise and to fertilize the seeds of cynicism and discord. Mr. Chairman, the President has pledged to "bring us together." We in the House can move toward this goal by continuing and strengthening the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, in its short history, the legal services program has had a significant impact not only in improving the lives of poor people but also in changing the outlook of the entire community. Legal services lawyers have brought the reality of full representation into more than 800 neighborhood offices around the country. Disadvantaged groups for the first time have been given effective help in bringing their legitimate grievances to the bar of justice. Access to the courts has long been available to economically privileged people. Now poor people, too, can share in this basic right.

A little noted effect of the legal services program has been its influence on the legal and business profession in this country. Through the program, the needs and concerns of poor people have been articulated and given stature in a way that they never before enjoyed. Merchants are more responsive to their clients, rich and poor alike. Laws for the protection of the consumer have been adopted all over the country, often at the suggestion of the business community.

Litigation by legal services attorneys has received wide publicity in recent years. The cases challenging the validity of unfair consumer practices, welfare regulations, housing codes have generated broad interest in the problems of the poor, especially among members of the legal profession. It is significant that the most vocal support for the legal services activities has come from organizations such as the American Bar Association and the National Legal Aid and Defender Association. Lawyers in private practice have recognized the need for insuring the professional independence of legal services lawyers; they fully realize that any attempt to allow political interference in the operation of the pro-

gram is a threat to the right to counsel itself. They recognize the need of poor people to have effective advocates.

Law schools, too, have felt the impact of the legal services program. In recent years, many top-ranking law graduates have chosen to work in neighborhood offices serving poor communities rather than joining prestigious law firms which pay high salaries. Law school curriculums have reflected this change in focus; the number of courses on poverty law, welfare rights, housing development has increased substantially every year. The curriculum of Columbia Law School, my alma mater, is a refreshing breath of fresh air, compared to the curriculum of a generation ago when I was a student there. The law schools' concern with maintaining the integrity of the legal services program is demonstrated by the petitions opposing the Murphy amendment or other limiting legislation which poured in from over 11,000 law students and over 85 law schools all over the country. Such concern should not be treated lightly.

Mr. Chairman, OEO's legal services program is no panacea; but it is an effective program. It deserves our support.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the OEO program. I have been critical of a number of aspects of the administration of this program but am encouraged by the progress that has been made in eliminating some of the deficiencies in the past, and I think the President and his new Director, Donald Rumsfeld, should be given the opportunity to make good on this program, as the President has requested.

There are a number of OEO programs whose usefulness is widely appreciated—for example, Headstart, with its emphasis on the preschool, formative years, so that children are not so far behind in the first grade that they never catch up; the excellent family planning program; and JOBS—Job Opportunities in the Business Sector. The latter program involves private business in the recruiting, training, and hiring of unemployed and low-income persons and will place 60,000 hard-core unemployed in 1970. But the abuses in some other OEO programs areas spill over in the public's mind to all programs, and there is a risk that we will overact and throw out the baby with the bathwater.

I should like to comment on two areas of the program that have been most criticized in my State—the community action operations and the legal services program.

The most serious abuses in some of the community action programs are a matter of genuine concern. There has been needless turmoil and unproductive controversy. I could not support this aspect of OEO unless I was convinced that we have an understanding of why these abuses occurred and that they can and will be corrected. How did community action programs go wrong in so many instances? A principal reason is

that the original theory behind these programs was that there should be no control of any kind over these programs but that they should be entirely unfettered exercises in "participatory democracy." This may have worked had it not been that these CAP operations viewed the local government as an enemy to be confronted, rather than as a group with resources to be utilized by CAP. Confrontation is now being replaced by partnership, alienation is being replaced by alliances, and practical achievements are the result. Also, the lack of coordination of programs within a State has been helped by greater emphasis being placed on the participation of the States in the planning and supervision of the local programs. New administrative regulations are being drawn up to carry out these ideas.

I have had the opportunity to talk with Mr. Donald Rumsfeld, head of the OEO, on several occasions concerning the CAP and some of the disruptive personalities involved in it in my State and am convinced that he is aware of the shortcomings of CAP and is taking effective measures to correct them. President Nixon and Mr. Rumsfeld should have the chance to show that they can solve these problems and develop a workable program.

The legal services programs have received much unfair criticism—unfair, because it is not the legal services program or the manner in which it is administered, which causes trouble but the lawsuits themselves. It has always been the lawyer's lot to have the public confuse the lawyer with his case. It has been the crowning glory of the lawyer that he continues to represent unpopular causes out of a sense of duty and out of respect for the ethics of his profession. For example, a migrant worker's lawsuit charging a county government with poor sanitation conditions is not likely to be greeted with enthusiasm by the local county commissioners. It does not mean that the OEO is attacking sanitation conditions in the county. What OEO does is to provide an impartial lawyer for someone—a client—who wishes to attack these conditions. And the fact that this is possible gives the migrant worker the option of bringing his complaint through the judicial process. Otherwise, he might seek redress in other less orderly ways. The Eisenhower Commission on Violence has emphasized the importance of the legal services program in providing remedies through orderly judicial channels as an alternative to violent methods of complaint. The American Bar Association has recommended a substantial increase in funds for this program for the same reasons. We argue that violence is unnecessary in this country because there are orderly ways of redressing grievances. This program helps make this claim a reality for without it most of the poor have no legal services program. To tell the poor now that legal services are to be cut back and that their lawyers cannot entertain cases of broad social significance would destroy all the gains achieved by the program. The threat of restrictions will cause the poor to view the program as one more paternalistic

handout, meant to deceive but not to help effectively. It will only make them more cynical.

Any amendment which would give the Governor of a State veto power over the program should be defeated as a totally unwarranted invasion of the judicial process. We do not allow a Governor to interfere in any other kind of lawsuit and to allow him a veto power of funding and refunding programs would allow him to influence the judicial process and permit him to destroy the program. The lawyer should be subject only to the ethical standards of the profession. These standards have a long and honorable tradition; I trust them to provide a fair result more than I do the political winds and vagaries of popular opinion that will be brought to bear on a Governor's veto. We should never sanction political interference with the attorney-client relationship, just as we should resist all efforts to politicize our courts. We are tampering here with the foundation upon which the rule of law rests.

The legal services program is a visible demonstration of equal justice to the poor, a demonstration that they have redress to their grievances through legal means rather than through illegal demonstrations. Let us remember that those who make peaceful revolutions impossible make violent revolutions inevitable.

All of the OEO programs are a visible demonstration of concern to the poor, and especially the black poor. They represent action rather than promises and so help bring about reconciliation between our people. Because there have been abuses, we must not lose sight of the main thrust of the program in attacking root causes of unrest in this country. Some of its programs are controversial but we must not lose sight of the forest fires because of the burning trees.

Unfortunately, OEO has been oversold in the past, leading to false expectations that it would end poverty. Of course, it will do no such thing. But its goal is a valid one: To find better ways to help the poor. None of this is to excuse the blunders that have been made in the program. But we must realize that such a program has never been attempted before, and we have had to make our own mistakes in the learning process. When we find that a part of the program is not working or is too expensive, then we should come up with a better way and continue to move forward.

The OEO, while far from perfect, is on the right track: For it seeks to make the poor productive and not make them wealthy. The Government has not enough money to make the poor wealthy but Government can make the poor productive, so that they can make themselves wealthy.

The OEO programs say to the poor and the black that there is a great reservoir of good will toward them, and that our country is making a great effort to improve their lot. Unemployment is especially acute among Negroes, already so alienated from society, and the young. One-fourth of all Negro boys and one-fifth of all Negro girls cannot find

jobs. Such a young person is cut off from his chance. Fulfillment, the flower of freedom, is denied them. OEO programs will not eliminate poverty. It may be, as the Bible says, that "the poor shall never cease out of the land." But these programs have an important bearing on the personal morale of the young person—they help them make his own escape from poverty. We now know that poverty is self-perpetuating. We must do something to break the cycle. It is difficult to evaluate the achievements of the OEO in breaking the cycle. Some of the programs have promised too much and delivered too little. None has been perfect. But we must not let the best be the enemy of the good. We can and should make improvements, but we must not destroy the program. To do so is to crush hope and opportunity.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, in May of 1966 California rural legal assistance was granted \$1.3 million by the Office of Economic Opportunity to become the first legal services program in the Nation especially designed to assist rural poor people. It operates nine regional law offices spanning some 650 miles and serving a poverty population of 550,000 in 16 California counties.

Since its inception it has been generally regarded as one of the most highly skilled and successful legal service programs in the country. In 1968 CRLA was designated as the outstanding legal service program in the country by the National Advisory Committee for Legal Services and one of its lawyers was named the outstanding poverty attorney in the Nation.

I suppose it is inevitable that a successful organization of lawyers will kindle opposition from those who are on the losing end. In the case of CRLA, its high-quality work has resulted in a very high percentage of victories for its clients. During the last year, for instance, CRLA clients prevailed in 83 percent of its cases decided in court. Furthermore, CRLA clients won 90 percent of the 1,600 cases decided in administrative hearings. This does not take into account the 2,000 plus settlements CRLA attorneys won on behalf of their clients.

I would like to discuss some of the political attacks and other criticisms made of CRLA. The earliest criticism was that poor people should not be allowed to bring suits against State and Federal Government agencies. In fact, in 1967, Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California, offered an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act to prohibit legal service programs from suing governmental agencies.

The argument was, that since government funds are used to pay legal service salaries, government agencies should be immune from lawsuits. The fact that public defenders have long been hired by the government to represent indigent clients against government prosecution was seemingly overlooked. This criticism in 1967 came after CRLA attorneys had obtained a Federal court order and a

settlement from the U.S. Department of Labor protecting the jobs of American workers from importation of bracero labor, and after the California Supreme Court ruled in a case brought by CRLA attorneys that the State government had acted illegally in depriving poor people of medical benefits. The argument obviously was not that legal service attorneys were taking cases that had no merit, because in each of these two cases, CRLA clients prevailed. The American Bar Association strongly opposed the 1967 amendment on the ground that it would be in violation of the canons of legal ethics, preventing attorneys from raising all defenses and claims to which their clients were entitled. Congress then rejected the notion that State and Government agencies should be subject to having their actions reviewed only by those who can afford it.

A second criticism that has been leveled at CRLA is a claim that it handles too many law reform cases and too many class action cases. As with all legal service programs, the substantial majority of cases handled by CRLA have involved a single problem for an individual client. From July 1, 1968, through June 30, 1969, CRLA attorneys handled 15,423 legal problems. Of these, 13,820—or 89 percent—involved a single client. Most of the remaining 11 percent involved drafting of bylaws for organizations, negotiating leases on contracts, and in some cases, litigation. CRLA attorneys filed 63 class actions—less than one-half of 1 percent of the program's total caseload. It might be well to examine some of these more politically controversial cases.

In Hernandez against Hardin, suit was brought on behalf of hungry children in Hollister, Calif., to require the State and Federal Governments to institute a food program in San Benito County. The facts showed that under State law seeing eye dogs received a better diet than most poor children. Children residing in every county surrounding San Benito were provided with surplus food or food stamps, but solely on the basis of county of residence, those in San Benito were ineligible.

It is interesting to note that after the case was filed, the California attorney general and Max Rafferty, superintendent of public instruction in California, joined with CRLA in seeking a court order to change the situation. As a result of the action, food is now provided to the eligible in all 15 California counties which were not participating in a food program when this suit was filed.

A second case, Macias against Finch, was a class action filed on behalf of 22 low income children against the Federal-State "don't work rule." Welfare rules provide all needy children with welfare and medical assistance, including children whose fathers are unemployed or ill or who have deserted them; however, because of the "don't work rule," needy children of fully employed fathers get no medical or welfare assistance even where their fathers' paycheck is half what would be received if he didn't work and instead received welfare. The children represented by CRLA asked that their fathers' wage be supplemented to

receive the same amount as children whose fathers do not work.

A third case, Munoz against California Department of Employment, involved enforcement of California field sanitation laws. The record included testimony from 107 witnesses documenting 1,869 growers violations of the law. The investigator for the California Division of Industrial Welfare testified that over 90 percent of all agricultural employees are in violation of the law, endangering consumers as well as farmworkers. The Sacramento superior court, in light of this evidence, ordered the department of employment to investigate agricultural employer field conditions before referring workers to farmwork.

Other recent CRLA cases involve, first, a claim of unfair competition by growers who knowingly, deliberately, and systematically employ illegal aliens costing U.S. farmworkers and taxpayers \$131 million a year in wages and welfare support; second, a ruling by a Federal court in San Francisco that the welfare department may no longer require needy Catholic mothers to file for divorce in order to qualify for immediate aid for their children; third, suits to compel enforcement of State laws establishing the minimum wage for women and minors in agriculture. Again this suit was won; fourth, a case challenging the exclusion of farmworkers from unemployment compensation, pointing out an estimated annual savings in California welfare costs of over \$7 million; and fifth, a petition to the Food and Drug Administration to eliminate the tolerance on DDT because scientific evidence shows that the chemical causes cancer in test animals. Less than 30 days after the petition was filed, HEW Secretary Finch announced plans to phase out uses of DDT.

The only other criticism which has sometimes been directed against CRLA is the claim that CRLA, in representing farmworkers, has become involved with the farmworker union in Delano. Of course, conditions in the CRLA grant prohibit its attorneys from bringing suits on behalf of any union. In November 1967 the General Accounting Office conducted an investigation to determine whether CRLA had violated the terms of its grant. A 12-man team of GAO investigators spent 3 months examining documents and interviewing those who made allegations against the program as well as CRLA staff. In May 1968 the GAO released a 50-page report which cleared CRLA of all charges brought against it.

Since the criticism of CRLA does not go to the quality of legal work CRLA attorneys provide to their clients, it is fair to say they are philosophical in nature and touch on the question of just what relationship a legal service attorney should have with his client. I think that the continued success of the OEO legal service programs depends upon the resolution of this question.

The American Bar Association, in opposing the placement of absolute veto power in the hands of a Governor, said that doing so is "highly undesirable because experience has shown that the

power to veto may be used to circumscribe the freedom of legal service attorneys in representing their clients to address issues of governmental action or omission affecting the rights of their clients, and to discourage actions which are politically unpopular or adverse to the views of majority; and whereas, such limitations impair the ability of legal services programs to respond properly to the needs of the poor and constitute oppressive interference with the freedom of the lawyer and the citizen."

Because the side effects of this amendment may be to eliminate or circumscribe vigorous and complete legal services for blacks and other minorities seeking to see that the law is enforced through the courts, the unfortunate effect may be to leave them the streets as their only available tribunal. If respect for the law is to have any meaning, it is of paramount importance to see that the poor are permitted full and effective use of the legal system.

As Chief Justice Burger stated to the 10th Circuit Judiciary Conference on July 1 of this year, legal services for the poor can only be effective if they are wholly removed from political conflicts and from executive control.

If grievances, frustrations and discontent are to be resolved in courts of law and not in sidewalk confrontations and if we are to achieve equal justice under the law, this amendment must not become law.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, finally, the time has come to test the wisdom of the House of Representatives. It is time to demonstrate that the Congress is fully aware of the unfortunate priorities which exist in this country. It is time for the Congress to show its concern for the domestic welfare of the Nation.

The trials and tribulations of even reporting a poverty bill to the floor of the House do not offer hope for the effort to reverse national priorities. The hearings and debates on this legislation have stretched over most of this current year. And here we are—yet without a united effort from a committee whose responsibility must be to effect the new priorities it knows are necessary.

Today, my hat comes off for the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, CARL PERKINS. His tireless though exhausting devotion to this legislation—to the truth about poverty and about the programs designed to bring some relief to poverty—are no less than noteworthy. I have observed a fearless legislator take on an uphill battle in stride. I feel privileged to serve on a committee chaired by such a distinguished and committed Member of Congress. May I assure him, the people of my congressional district—poor people throughout this Nation—shall not forget his efforts.

The leadership he has provided is, today, being challenged by those whose distorted and naive views of poverty in

this Nation threaten to kill all hope for addressing this tragic national problem with a realistic solution. The extensive hearings before the ad hoc task force on poverty on which I served left no doubt about the clear need which exists for a more complete and extensive commitment to the eradication of poverty and the conditions bred by persistent poverty. The programs of the Economic Opportunity Act were designed to cope with the problems we have lived with in the First Congressional District of Missouri. We have witnessed the positive results produced by the Headstart program in our neighborhoods. We have participated in the community action programs. We are aware of the pitfalls of the problems—and most of all, we can demonstrate some expertise in discussing the needs of inner-city citizens because we live with these needs daily.

It is in this legislation which we consider this week that the truth about our national priorities and commitments comes clearly to the surface. It is in and through the consideration of this legislation whereby the membership of the House makes its mark—when lip-service is translated into meaning—for alleviating the tragedies of a free Nation, or for resolving that there will always be slums and people to live in them.

It is disgraceful that this Government and this Congress can support the spending of \$77 billion on defense—but only \$3 billion on education. It is disgraceful that this Government has insisted upon and won a \$5 billion expenditure for a G-5A airplane, while it spends less than \$2 billion on the poverty program. It is a disgrace that we can spend \$40 billion in space exploration but only \$86 million to research a cure for cancer.

It is a shame that Americans sit back while we spend \$20,000 just for the ammunition to kill each Vietcong and only \$53 to educate each American child. Americans are spending more than \$200 million just to get one rocket to the launching pad—but only \$550 million for the entire school lunch program.

These are the things that should cause Americans to bow their heads in shame. The disgrace lies—not in the fact that hunger and poverty exists—but in the priorities which unfortunately now predominate in this Congress and Government.

When the Congress is told the military needs more guns and ammo for Vietnam, the Congress votes the money. But when the Congress is shown the evidence to prove that 22 million poor and 13 million near-poor Americans are desperately in need of food, the Congress debates, the Congress marks time, the Congress engages in political maneuvers, and finally, the Congress consents to approve only a fraction of the sum necessary.

If we are ever to claim the greatness of this Nation, the facts about our priorities must be brought to the surface. Americans cannot always keep their eyes toward the sky and their hopes on the moon—the future of the Nation lies here on the solid ground and our hopes must be found in the faces of all the people who live on this American earth.

To those who are banking on the silent majority, I would say that I believe it is because Americans have not gotten the facts, because they do not really know where the bulk of their tax money is going, that they are silent. It is this silence which some misinterpret as approval. I just do not believe that Americans—when they know the facts—will be silent.

Let us consider once more the extent of poverty in this country. According to official figures, there are 22 million poor people in the Nation, an additional 13 million near-poor and of this number 5.1 million people are classified as the very poor, since they have no cash income at all; and 9.3 million of these people are in the category of "hard-core poor," which means they live in families whose incomes are less than \$2,400 per year for a family of four. The remaining poor are the 10.6 million people whose incomes are between \$2,400 and \$3,600 per year.

We are not reaching these people. Public assistance programs serve only 40 percent of the poor people. The assistance payments provided in some states are less than 50 percent of what the State itself considers a necessary standard.

In spite of the statistics of the fact of poverty stricken Americans, it is pretty hard to convince people, including Congressmen, that there are 22 million Americans who are living in destitute poverty and hunger. We do not want to believe it could have happened here. We certainly do not want the rest of the world to believe it.

Hunger and poverty have been hard to establish because the victims are hidden from view of the masses of our public. They are concentrated in slums we dare not drive through. They are in mountains we do not visit. They are in remote rural areas that we see only as beautiful green pastures as we fly over them.

Americans must learn that a man in rags is not always a drunkard or a junkie. Americans must learn that an unkept pregnant mother is not always carrying an illegitimate child—that she probably has no knowledge or access to birth control—that she probably will have no doctor's care in carrying and delivering her child—and that her child is probably already cursed by her own malnutrition.

Until Americans—until Members of the Congress—spend as much time trying to understand as they do trying to condemn poverty, we cannot become a great nation.

In this country, we cheer success and we boo the failures. We are all conditioned to the great American success stories of "rags to riches." If we see a man in rags, we wonder why he has not worked for riches. That, indeed, is the nature of most concern for him.

It is a distorted idea which has been planted in the minds of Americans—that poverty-stricken Americans are responsible for their poverty—that hungry Americans are lazy, dumb, un dependable. The truth is that many poor Americans appear lazy, may be retarded and consequently un dependable, because they suffer the effects of long-lived hunger

and malnutrition. Untold numbers of these people are actually starving, without food for days at a time—subsisting on starch and Kool-Aid, dog food and tree bark. Severe malnutrition, which shortens life and limits physical and mental growth is evidenced throughout this land of plenty.

When former HEW Secretary Wilbur Cohen testified before our committee early this year, he pointed out that every retarded child produced in this country will cost between \$100,000 and \$150,000 to take care of during its lifetime. His conclusion is that spending a couple hundred dollars a year more on the food programs for a family—to raise the nutrition level—is more than warranted.

The answer so often given is that we cannot now afford to assist these hungry, poverty-stricken people. It has been said on the floor of this House that we should spend—but we cannot now afford to spend—for the poverty programs. But I am here to tell you today that we cannot afford not to spend this money—that we cannot afford not to fund poverty programs, which are starting to have an impact upon their target areas.

Whether or not the lack of any commitment from this Government stems from a lack of understanding or mere political considerations is not important. Commissions and committees and councils have documented the facts on the nature of the effects of poverty. Information is readily available. The books have said what some of us know from experience to be true about ghettos, about hunger, about social, economic, and political deprivation. You do not have to be poor to understand it, if you are literate and willing to open your mind to the truth.

Mr. Chairman, I am accurately reflecting the views of many of my constituents. We have waited long years, we have looked for hope, we have prayed for a national understanding of government's responsibility to act on these problems. We want to act within the system, but you cannot expect us to do so if we are not given entrance into that system.

I want, now, to call attention to several programs which are of particular interest to the people of my district. We support the continuation of the comprehensive health services program initiated in 1965. In February of this year, such a project was funded in the city of St. Louis. In cooperation with other community efforts, some federally funded, we are hopeful that the health needs of poor people will be recognized and met.

Many of the poor who use their local neighborhood health center find themselves being treated by doctors for the first time in their lives. The otherwise often critical General Accounting Office report on the programs of OEO said of the comprehensive health services program:

Many of those reached have been provided with their first affiliation with readily accessible medical care on an unfragmented basis.

The neighborhood health center has become the major element of the comprehensive health services program.

Through this program, service can be aimed also at the prevention and treatment of narcotics addiction, and the rehabilitation of narcotics addicts. This is one of the great problems in our urban poverty areas. It is only relatively recently that the country has begun to face the problem of drugs addiction in its proper perspective and to search for ways to deal with the situation as a whole. These programs are, however, so minimally funded that the intent of the law is only an intent—and not established through implementation. This program should be given the resources to move on drug addiction.

The need for increasing the funds for this program is clear. It is this program—particularly through the neighborhood health service element of it—which is showing hope for making a difference in the health care problems traditionally associated with the poor: infant mortality; the great likelihood of sustained, debilitating diseases; malnutrition-related health problems; mental retardation; and shorter life expectancy.

But there are only 49 comprehensive health programs in the Nation serving an approximate 300,000 people. The neighborhood health centers operate in only 23 of the 50 States. It is documented fact that the total poor population goes without necessary health services—and this program is reaching only a fraction of those numbers. There is hope that the program will be expanded to enable it to serve at least 1 million poor people, but these are cautious hopes which rest upon our action here today.

I am further concerned that title V, part B, of the OEO law has not been made a reality. This is the provision for day-care centers for children of families who need such assistance to remain—or to become self-sufficient. The need for day care is raised frequently in this body. There is much talk about providing it through this, that, or the other law—or a combination of several laws. But the fact is that other programs are not adequately serving the low-income population, and the need for these services goes unmet.

We are not so concerned about who provides the service, but no program is providing day-care services for the poor.

Through OEO, in 1967, the Emergency Food and Medical Service was initiated to serve a purpose not incorporated into any existing food program for poor people. It is shown that many people do not participate in the food programs simply because they are not identified, found, or put in touch with the food.

Of the 3,098 counties in the United States, 1,125 choose to participate in the commodity distribution food program. But fewer than 12 percent of those counties serve as many as 60 percent of the poor people in their areas who need the food. Some 1,139 counties participate in the food stamp program and only 20 of those counties manage to serve even 60 percent of the people who need stamps. On the average, food stamp counties reach fewer than 20 percent of the people eligible.

There are seven States in the country which refuse to participate in the food

stamp program. And there are 413 counties in the United States which have no food program at all.

Our responses to the hunger needs of poor people are no less than disgraceful. Recently, the State of California Legislature passed a law to require that all counties in California participate in the food stamp program. But the good Governor of that State vetoed the bill. In light of this one example, it makes no sense to maintain that State and local communities should have the reins of control over programs for the poor.

The House Committee on Agriculture decided yesterday, I understand, that the McGovern Senate bill for a much-expanded food stamp effort is not worthy of Federal funds—one more slap to the hope of poor people. A family which is poor has only one chance in three of living in a county which has a food stamp program—and if it happens to live in such a county, it still has only one chance in six of participating in the program.

Through the special OEO program, EFMS, the participation of poor people in Federal food programs has been increased as much as 25 percent in many counties. Though this program—and only through this program—are outreach efforts made. The EFMS has demonstrated success and it deserves meaningful expansion with funds to accomplish its objectives. OEO budgeted only \$30 million for this program in 1970—having spent \$24 million in 1969. It would require \$25 million just to keep the present programs operational. No new programs could be contemplated and existing programs could not, on these funds, be expanded. Our committee has given special emphasis to this program and is requesting an authorization of \$92 million for EFMS. I hope the House will respect that emphasis.

I am particularly concerned that the special impact program, title I-D of the act now before us, be stressed by our action today. This title provides for comprehensive community and economic development programs in urban poverty areas and in rural areas having high rates of out-migration to urban ghettos. This program deserves and requires a concentration of funds if it is to have any appreciable effect on unemployment, dependency and community tensions within urban ghettos.

At the beginning of the program, in fiscal years 1967 and 1968, a number of models for special impact programs were tried. The Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor Departments and OEO all sponsored I-D programs in an attempt to test different approaches. Out of this experience emerged the model of a community development corporation, representing a partnership between inner-city residents and the business community. The purpose of the community corporation is to mobilize resources for the economic development of the inner-city and rural areas. The critical notion is that the people of a poverty area, given the aid and assistance of the local business community, can develop the business enterprises that blighted areas so desperately need.

Let me give you an example of how the recently funded special impact program in the Union Sarah area of St. Louis is working. Union Sarah is the center of St. Louis. The area has a population of about 40,000, 50 percent of whom fall below the poverty standards. Unemployment was almost 40 percent higher than the citywide average in 1960 and is much greater now. Most of the multifamily dwellings are between 50 and 75 years old. Blight is widespread as is poor health, inadequate education, and drug addiction.

In the course of a few months, the residents have organized for an effective special impact program. They have developed programs for several manufacturing plants, retail shops, a fund to help local struggling contractors with loans and technical assistance, and a credit union. They are also in the process of filing for the sale of stock to community residents to support their program.

I think that this program is one of the most promising that I have seen. It not only provides jobs and management opportunities in the ghetto areas, where the poor are, but it provides the incentive for people to develop their own energies and talents. It is self-help in the great traditions we talk about in this country.

Similar efforts are going on in other parts of the country. In Bedford-Stuyvesant, in Hough, in Chicago, in Washington, D.C., and in a number of rural areas where many of our problems begin—in eastern Kentucky, in Georgia, in southwest Virginia, and in North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, the special impact program is an intelligent, responsible approach to urban problems.

Mr. Chairman, these are only a few programs of the total OEO effort which must, like the others, continue to operate without the inhibiting proposals for State control of poverty efforts which will be offered here today.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity is committed to providing equal justice for American citizens who happen to be poor. The legal services program does this by providing vigorous representation against what citizens of ordinary means would regard as outrageous persecution.

However, I am deeply concerned to see that the efforts of this program are being threatened by amendments which would provide an item veto over the legal services program and would eliminate the OEO Director's right to override a Governor's veto of a legal services program.

One of the main arguments for the adoption of this particular amendment is that legal services attorneys have been filing suits against Government agencies on behalf of the poor. Since, of course, all citizens are allowed to file suits against any Government agency, the problem cannot be merely the existence of such suits for the poor. Apparently, proponents of this amendment feel that Government-paid attorneys should not chal-

lunge the activities of other Government agencies.

I would like to point out that there is ample precedent for such activity. The Department of Justice, for example, often goes to court to insure State compliance with a Federal law. States and cities frequently oppose Federal decrees and orders in antitrust and other areas. The attorneys in these cases are Government paid.

I do not feel that it is unusual or harmful for the poor to turn to the legal services program for assistance against another government agency. After all, if legal assistance is unavailable to the poor, would we rather they turned to violence as a means of announcing their dissatisfaction with a Government agency?

In fiscal year 1969, legal services program attorneys, working from 850 law offices in poverty communities throughout the country, assisted poor persons in 610,000 cases. Of cases which went to court, the lawyers won favorable decisions for their clients in around 70 percent and negotiated settlements in an additional 15 percent.

These are impressive statistics. They are so impressive that I would like to transfer them into more human, concrete terms.

These figures speak of poor families who were restored welfare benefits upon which they relied for their food, health care, clothing and shelter. They tell of aged citizens whose social security benefits were mistakenly cut off and later restored. They speak of job opportunities which could have been lost forever because of discriminatory hiring practices.

They reflect the resolution of intolerable family situations, of obtaining custody of a beloved child, of support funds secured from a deserting father. Hidden within these figures are the faces of wayward children who were given the opportunity to start again with an unblemished record before society, and the histories of youngsters able to complete their education after the threat of expulsion.

Then there are the numbers which stand for evictions and resultant family separations averted, for garnishments and inevitable job losses forestalled. And not least, there is also a long column for citizens who found protection against the fraudulent practices of unscrupulous lenders and merchants.

But among all these totals are victories in the long run perhaps even more significant than the many individual financial losses and other human suffering which were prevented. For these 610,000 cases have resulted in a new respect for law and our legal process among poor persons. They have fostered the growth of a sense of dignity, of a realization of being treated fairly by the "system." They reflect civil disturbances which were and will be prevented because the poor of this country know they can achieve a just resolution of their grievances in a peaceful, orderly fashion with a capable attorney at their side.

I am as impressed as anyone by numbers, and wish to give the program credit for their remarkable statistics. But in ad-

dition, I must also congratulate these dedicated attorneys for contributions which can never be reflected in numbers: the conferral of dignity and self-respect on our poor citizens, and progress toward a more just and stable society.

Any attempt to curtail this vital program should be defeated.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, poverty amid plenty is a paradox this Nation set out to resolve 5 years ago when we declared war on poverty. The struggle over these years has been intense, and while we are unable to report that final victory has been won, considerable progress has been made.

The most significant progress is that we have established a framework for a new assault on poverty. We have created and stimulated individual concern among the poor themselves. We have given them the opportunity to plan for their own betterment. We have abandoned the usual traditional route of Government spoon-feeding. Anytime such innovation is attempted it can be expected to raise a large howl within the establishment.

President Nixon, while withholding full and unconditional endorsement for this program, is at least on record in support of a 2-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. His Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, our former colleague, Donald Rumsfeld, has indicated support of a straight 2-year extension so that he will have an opportunity to review and survey the program and offer his own recommendations for change. The President's spokesmen in this House instead want to emasculate the poverty program by converting it to a State-planned, State-administered, and State-initiated program for the poor. Obviously, there are many Governors who would like control over these Federal funds. Just as obviously it will be spent in the same old traditional way. The "breadline" hand-out of charity will be the custom of the day again. It is admitted that it has not worked. If we really want to abolish poverty, if we really want to give new hope to the children of the poor, we must not abandon them now. If this substitute amendment carries we will have retrogressed. We will have lost all the ground we turned over. We will be back at the very beginning—we will only have programs for the poor; none by the poor.

There is no room for compromise. Either we believe in human equality, in human dignity or we do not. Either we believe that the poor are entitled to plan their programs of self-help or we do not. Either we have the confidence in the people, all people, including the poor, to know what is best for themselves, or we do not. We cannot legislate a little bit of equality, a little bit of dignity. What this House does today is critical. If we defeat this substitute State control amendment, we will renew and fortify the belief we first expressed that the poor have the right to participate in, direct, initiate and implement local community

programs for their own self improvement.

The overall effect of the State turnover amendment will be to mute the voices of the poor who have been striving to make themselves seen and heard by affluent America—for the greatest friend of poverty is public apathy, and its greatest enemy is disclosure. When our people know about the existence of poverty I am confident they are willing to do whatever is required to end it. But they will never know about it as long as the poor are kept suppressed and confined to a client in the ghetto far from the green acres of suburbia.

Our poverty program has sometimes been noisy and it has stirred discontent—but that is precisely what must be done if we are to succeed in our war against poverty. There must be change in a fundamental way if this effort is to succeed.

For the many poor we have already helped since the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964 shall we roll back the hope we have offered them and crush their new confidence in themselves and in their Government? I hope not.

The measure of success of this program is in the hearts and lives of these whom it has helped. That is what the poverty program is all about, and I urge my colleagues to extend this law by voting for H.R. 12321 without any crippling amendments.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. In reply to a question which I asked a few moments ago of a Member in the well concerning the Governor's veto, he stated it is the same in both bills. Is that the entire story concerning the Governor's veto?

Mrs. MINK. No. Under the present law the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity has the power to override the Governor's veto. However, the substitute amendment would leave the absolute authority in the hands of the Governor of the State.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, the proposed substitute has been called a crippling amendment—this is not true and everyone knows it. OEO is crippled but the damage has been self-inflicted.

The "track record" of OEO makes it crystal clear that a thorough "shakeup" in the entire structure is needed sorely and long overdue. The bill reported out of the House committee recommends no substantial changes in the operation of the current scandal-ridden poverty program except to increase the amount of money that will be historically squandered.

Since its inception in 1964, the Office of Economic Opportunity has spent more than \$7.5 billion—with a crumb of this immense sum reaching the poor but plenty lining the pockets of the self-ap-

pointed do-gooders appointed to administer the program. It would be the height of folly for Congress to vote additional billions for OEO without a full reorganization. I hope the professional poverty cats have had their day—now it is time for the poor.

The proposal for another study to pinpoint OEO shortcomings is futile and repetitious.

There have been studies galore. OEO itself has spent some \$30 million on surveys and analyses of every conceivable kind—wholly to no avail. The General Accounting Office, on express congressional orders, made an exhaustive study at a cost of more than \$1 million. Its 188-page report contained numerous constructive recommendations. Nothing has been done with these reports—except to gather "dust" in the offices of the OEO lounges.

To spend more money and time on more of this would be utterly ridiculous. What is urgently needed is a "top-to-bottom" housecleaning forthwith and implement basic changes in concept and administration.

For example, there is a particular county in Kentucky consisting of 42,000 people. They have a federally funded community health project. This single county has eight health clinics. The OEO appropriation for that county is \$1,104,000. The county appropriation in that county for the county health program is \$90,000. The doctor who oversees this program draws \$18,000 a year as an employee of the county. He also draws, if he were to work full time, approximately \$1,600 a month administering the OEO health program. But sadly enough, he spends only about 1 hour a day, perhaps 2 hours, maybe not even that. Almost \$750,000 of the \$1,104,000 is spent for administrative costs. That is totally reprehensible. It is unbelievable that this amount of money could be spent for administrative costs.

Another one. Some \$20,000 in Federal funds were used to finance a fishing school on the British island of Bimini, a frequent watering spot for one of our colleagues. The Caribbean program was staffed by two British fishermen receiving \$100 and \$75 per week, the class consisted of one American student. Thousands were spent on this project.

In New Jersey an OEO project has been purchasing pornographic books to allegedly improve the reading skills of the trainees. Taxpayers picked up the \$10,000 tab for such training literature as "The French Art of Love," "Orgy at Madam Dracula's," and "The Nude Wore Black." It appears the purchasing agent found "Wife Swappers" a hot item: the voucher listed a purchase of 25 copies. It would be possible to fill a room full of file cabinets concerning abuses in the present poverty program.

In my own State of Iowa, Mrs. Mary Thompson, office manager of the anti-poverty agency and a former inmate at the women's reformatory at Rockwell City, Iowa, was charged January 1968, with embezzlement of program funds estimated between \$5,000 and \$6,000. The director said Mrs. Thompson duped him into signing blank checks which she then made payable to herself.

A subsequent audit of the books indicated faulty bookkeeping and accounting that went beyond Mrs. Thompson's embezzlement. Questioned items of \$1,606 in cash and \$1,260 "in kind receipts" could not be supported by documents.

The present Iowa State director of OEO Bob Tyson was appointed by Gov. Bob Ray on January 16, 1969. Before the ink was dry on the press release of his appointment, he was thumbing through the technical assistance manuals trying to see what personal benefits were available to him. Mr. Robert Tyson was employed in the district office of an Iowa Congressman from June 1 through November 30, 1968. Tyson by his own admission stayed in Iowa on vacation for the next month and a half until his appointment as temporary director.

The OEO technical assistance manual states that moving expenses up to \$1,000 for the State director may be paid by the regional office to move household goods if that director does not reside in the community where he is to be employed.

I asked the OEO Kansas City office how they could justify the expenditure to move Mr. Tyson's household goods from McLean, Va., to Des Moines, Iowa. The regional office's letter to me of December 5, 1969, conceded that Mr. Tyson was a resident of Davenport, Iowa, for almost 6 months prior to his employment as temporary State OEO director, but still justified the expenditure.

I have asked the General Accounting Office for an immediate investigation into whether this is proper.

The letter from the Kansas City office follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
KANSAS CITY, MO., December 5, 1969.
HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: We have received telephone communications from Mr. Pat Breheny of your office questioning the reimbursement for moving expenses in the amount of \$216.68 to Mr. Robert F. Tyson when he accepted an appointment by Governor Ray of Iowa as the State Economic Opportunity Officer.

It was Mr. Breheny's contention that Mr. Tyson was not entitled to this reimbursement because he was not a resident of McLean, Virginia or Washington, D.C. at the time of his appointment. We contacted Mr. Tyson and asked him to send us a letter setting forth the chronology of his residency, with dates and conditions of employment. We asked Mr. Tyson as a matter of courtesy if he would furnish your office a copy of this letter, and he cheerfully agreed to do so. I am assuming this letter has reached you and you have had an opportunity to review it in light of the question raised.

A brief history of this request and its action by this office is in order. On February 6, 1969, we received a request from Mr. Al Lothrop, Fiscal Officer for the State of Iowa Office of Economic Opportunity, for permission to pay the actual moving costs of household goods to Mr. Tyson in accordance with CAP Memo 23A, Part B, Number 5. On February 14, 1969, Mr. Wayne Thomas, Regional Administrator for CAP in our office, wrote Mr. Lothrop granting permission to reimburse the actual moving expenses for Mr. Tyson. Enclosed are copies of this correspondence for your information.

No further inquiry was made concerning this matter until Mr. Breheny raised the questions verbally in telephone conversations with Mr. Wayne Thomas and with Mr.

William Shovell, my Deputy Regional Director.

Mr. Breheny was informed by Mr. Thomas that we had considered this an authorized and justifiable expense, and that if any irregularities did in fact exist, they normally would come to light in an audit, regularly conducted by the State Auditors Office in Iowa shortly after the end of the program year in which the expenditure was incurred. The time for this audit is not yet upon us, but a request by your office gives us an opportunity to look into this matter at this time, prior to the period it normally would be subject to review.

We have reviewed the matter quite thoroughly, both under the provisions of CAP Memo 23A, and in light of the specific language of Technical Assistance Memo 26 dated October 31, 1966, Subject: Personnel Policies and Procedures. Mr. Breheny has a copy of this memo. This memo contains a specific reference in Part B, page 3, Item 5, which states:

"Moving Costs. A grantee may apply to the OEO Regional Office for permission to pay the actual costs of moving household goods up to a maximum of \$1,000, for a person who is hired to be Staff Director or Deputy Staff Director and who resides outside the community where he is to work."

The language of this portion is fairly clear and specific. It should be kept in mind, however, that it is a general attempt to establish some fairly specific ground rules or guidelines that would prevent abuse of certain practices in the area of recruiting and hiring of personnel by grantees. As drafted, it generally meets the purpose for which it was written; however, I'm sure you realize that no guideline can be drawn which will cover every possible contingency that could arise. That this is anticipated is evidenced by the fact that Item 6 which follows this specific quotation provides for a waiver system for employees of state civil service systems or other merit systems that may exist in agencies receiving funding by OEO. Section 6 also contains waiver procedures so that a college or university may apply its customary personnel policies and procedures and may request a waiver of any specific requirement of Part B.

It is assumed by us that while the specific instances cited provide for waivers, they are not exclusive; and that other conditions might be considered by the waiver granting authority that are consistent with State, University or general prevailing business practices and procedures commonly used when recruiting executive personnel. Again, safeguards must be maintained to prevent abuse of this procedure. It is our feeling that the circumstances involving Mr. Tyson's reimbursement are not an abuse, but are perfectly within the framework and spirit for which Technical Assistance Memo 26 was written.

Mr. Tyson has informed us that he remained on Congressman Schwengel's payroll until December 25, 1968 and that he was appointed to his present position by Governor Ray on the day he took office, January 16, 1969. The longest period of residency while he was in the state of Iowa, prior to his resignation, was in Davenport and not in the community where he ultimately was to work. His residency in Davenport, and place of employment in the Congressman's Davenport office, was for the period starting June 1 through November 30, after which time he was on vacation in Iowa. It further appears only logical that the intent of Item 5 of Technical Assistance Memo 26 clearly was designed to make provisions for the household goods to be moved from where they are to a location where the staff person involved lives.

It is our feeling that the request for reimbursement was properly submitted and that reimbursement by the grantee was perfectly proper and within the purpose for

which these guiding procedures were written.

It is my sincere hope that this will meet the purposes of the inquiry verbally submitted to our office. If we can be of any further service to you, please feel free to call upon us at any time.

Thanking you for your consideration and wishing you warmest personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

William L. Shouell
for
DON THOMASON,
Regional Director.

A VISTA volunteer in Iowa wrote and said that he felt many of the OEO programs in Iowa should be reevaluated.

The volunteer said:

Because I am sponsored by a community action program I can well understand what you mean by waste as I have unofficially seen many such exploitations of the poor in our area.

A newspaperman in Iowa informed me of high salaries still being paid to professional poverty workers.

It has been estimated nationally that approximately three-fourths of the money going to community action programs is burned up in administrative costs. This compares with an average administration cost in a State welfare agency of between 7 and 8 percent.

The Columbia, Ohio, Citizen Journal summed it up best in their editorial when they said:

Of course every time anyone challenges the OEO, its rabid backers accuse him of picking on the "poor." But a bureaucracy which fritters away much of its money on administrative costs cannot be of much help to the poor.

We hope Congress and the Nixon administration will straighten out this agency, or find a better way of doing something genuinely useful for the people who need help.

To continue this multibillion-dollar program without major constructive changes would be a fallacy and hoax—the greatest ever perpetrated against both the taxpayers and the poor of America. I urge the adoption of the substitute.

(Mr. WHALEN (at the request of Mr. AYRES) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, my appraisal of the Office of Economic Opportunity, both in its concept and broad front of activities, convinces me that this is an agency the Government and the Nation need. I have been impressed by the significance of the added responsibilities allocated to the agency by the President and the progress made by its director in tooling up with improved staff and organizational structure to fulfill those responsibilities.

Community action—the localized implementation of OEO programs through community action agencies—continues to be one of the most significant and most valuable aspects of the Office of Economic Opportunity, regardless of errors and false starts made at the local level of activity in the past. I am pleased to report that Director Rumsfeld has acted to correct situations that gave rise to criticism previously.

OEO headquarters has refused to refund a number of community action

agencies and local delegate agencies which failed to perform satisfactorily. Meanwhile, a review of all community action agencies has been instituted to evaluate their effectiveness. A special team of experts was put to work reviewing grants released from the Office of Economic Opportunity prior to the close of fiscal year 1969.

Incredible as it may seem to some people, not until Director Rumsfeld assumed his duties had regulations been issued to enforce the section of the Economic Opportunity Act which limits administrative costs of poverty programs to not more than 15 percent of total costs. Such regulations have now been issued. Regulations have also been issued prohibiting local agencies from using Federal funds to pay interest on borrowed money.

Mr. Chairman, I am one who believes that the greatness of America, the dynamism of this country and its unique sources of strength derive from the individuality of its regions and localities. I strongly feel that the peculiar, local attributes of each region, State and county or town should be preserved when those native characteristics can contribute to our total capability. For this reason, I approve the measures that build in to the control and direction of community action agencies the right of local people to make plans and exercise local authority. At the same time, since their operations stem from Federal funding, I also deem it appropriate for the Office of Economic Opportunity to maintain and exert rights of supervision over the CAA's. Therefore, I am pleased to learn that new regulations will tighten administrative controls. Improved personnel standards and practices among grantee organizations will likewise be established.

At the same time, plans have already been instituted for spending up the time for processing grants—in line with the overall efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity to increase the responsiveness of institutions to the needs of the poor.

These are all indications of positive progress—progress which will be made much more significant when and as the bill before us is passed.

(Mr. WYATT (at the request of Mr. AYRES) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I call upon the Members of the House to defeat the crippling amendment to OEO's legal services program adopted by the Senate. This amendment, condemned by the organized bar and the U.S. Judicial Conference, would permit line-item veto power by a Governor as a response to certain types of lawsuits, even though brought in furtherance of the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act.

We cannot expect low-income citizens—or any American for that matter—to respect the rule of law if we, as public officials, sanction political interference with the legal process and encourage political retaliation for effective courtroom advocacy. Our most compelling task is to insure access to the legitimate institutions of the country for the perplexing problems of the poor.

A Murphy-type amendment would have a chilling effect upon the efforts of legal services attorneys to provide this access. It should be soundly defeated.

The President's National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence recently reminded us that poor people are regularly cheated, mistreated, and exploited by unscrupulous merchants, loan sharks, landlords, employers, unions—and, yes, even by some public agencies. The antagonism and frustration which this conduct engenders plagues every street in America today. Hence our choice: do we channel these grievances into the legal system we have developed over a period of two centuries for the express purpose of resolving conflicts without our society, or do we slam the courtroom door in the face of these citizens and invite them to seek a redress of grievances outside the existing legal process. In fact, of course, there is no real choice here; there is only a compelling obligation to make our legal system accessible to these pressing needs.

We cannot move toward this objective in the absence of a vigorous independent bar, able and willing to assert each client's right to the benefit of any and every remedy and defense that is authorized by the law of land. The pernicious effect of the Senate amendment is to divest legal service attorneys of this essential capability. It would subvert the historic independence of the bar and require poverty lawyers to practice law at the sufferance of a Governor. It would introduce a double standard of professional conduct for members of the bar, imposing political restrictions on attorneys representing poor people that are not applied to those with wealthier clients and less controversial issues. The President's National Commission specifically stated:

The independence of Government-supported programs providing legal services to the poor should be safeguarded against governmental intrusion into the selection of the types of cases Government-financed lawyers can bring on behalf of their indigent clients.

As Senator MURPHY indicated on the floor and in public statements, this is precisely what his amendment seeks to do.

It is ironic indeed that this frontal assault upon the legal services program should occur at a time when it has been proven to have a noticeable impact on the problems of the poor. During the last fiscal year, legal services attorneys handled about 610,000 cases. Of litigated cases, they won favorable decisions for their clients in approximately 70 percent and negotiated favorable settlements in an additional 15 percent.

This is a record that belies any claim that legal services are not needed or that they are wasteful. Arbitrary conduct by welfare agencies, unfair treatment by landlords, illegal interest rates by loan sharks, discrimination in municipal services, misrepresentation by merchants and a host of other inequities are the daily fare of many poor people in this country. We cannot any longer fail to respond to these conditions, or simply wish them away. A viable vigorous legal service program is an essential element in this ad-

ministration's response, and it must be protected against crippling amendments—not just the Murphy amendment, but any other proposal to temper or circumscribe the activities of legal services attorneys.

Murphy-type amendments represent a lamentable tendency to confuse the legal services attorneys who air problems of the poor in court, with the problems themselves. This is folly. Legal services attorneys did not, for example, create the desire of farmworkers for toilet facilities in the fields they work, or for sanitary conditions in the housing they occupy. Nor are legal services attorneys responsible for the fact that too many growers fail to provide these facilities—even though they are required by law. Are we to punish legal services for successfully pressing these and similar complaints brought by poor people which seek to require other citizens to obey the law? To do so would be cynical, and make a mockery of the claim that we seek to advance the rule of law in this country.

Fortunately, vast numbers of Americans have expressed to us their dismay at the prospect of amendments to limit legal services, and conveyed their strong support for the program. The Governor of my own State, the Honorable Tom McCall, has condemned the Murphy amendment, noting that even though Government officials may "be discomfited on occasion" by vexing suits, "it is a healthy thing for public officials to be required to face these tests, and it is an unhealthy attitude on their part to seek to prevent impecunious litigants from having their day in court." I am advised that five other Governors, from the States of Massachusetts, Maine, New Jersey, Rhode Island and Washington have also publicly announced their opposition to Murphy-type amendments.

They are in good company. The list of opponents to the Murphy amendment and supporters of legal services reads like a Who's Who. It includes the deans of 84 of the Nation's best law schools and more than 11,000 law students, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, the American Bar Association, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the U.S. Judicial Conference, the National Council of Churches, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Federal Bar Association, over a dozen State bar associations and countless local and regional organizations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to consider the groundswell of support for legal services from all across the country, and to resist any effort to circumscribe the efforts of these lawyers to provide equal justice for the Nation's poor.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, it is highly enlightening to me, in the face of the proposed Republican substitute, to see various Members on the Republican side who support particular elements of the poverty program cross the center aisle and ask us on the Democratic side whether we would not support amendments excluding their cherished individual programs from the dead hand effect of the Republican alternative.

It makes me wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether our Republican colleagues have come here to praise Caesar or to bury him. If the substitute offered by the Republicans makes sense, if it provides some element of needed State initiative. Why is it not good for the particular program they happen to support? Why is not sauce for the goose also sauce for the gander? If the Republican substitute is good medicine for the poverty program as a whole, why is it apparently such poison for popular elements of the program, like Headstart, VISTA, family planning services, et cetera?

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the evidence is inescapable that our colleagues from both parties who support this alternative know perfectly well that the dead hand of the Governors and the rural-oriented State legislatures are going to be the coup de grace of the poverty program.

When the poverty program was passed 5 years ago the basic purpose was to provide new thrust, new initiatives, adventure, some new approaches to creating public service programs in education, health, welfare, job training, and employment that were more relevant, and more sensitive to the special needs of the poor.

If we are going to hand back to the rural-oriented Governors mansions and State legislatures total control over poverty, we might as well bite that bullet and wind it up now.

Mr. Chairman, we know what the effects will be. We have had in recent months statements by the American Municipal Association representing the mayors, by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and by individual mayors protesting bitterly against the misapplication of the Governors' offices of funds that should have been made available to cities under the Safe Street Act.

It is in the cities of our Nation where violent personal crime has its most devastating effect, predatory crime that is terrorizing people and inspiring fear and desperation in urban neighborhoods across the country.

Yet mayors are coming down here by the hundreds, protesting, and their organizations have spoken out bitterly, that the Governors, instead of rifling in on the problem of crime where it is, in the cities, with a high-powered rifle and an 8-power scope—have preferred to use the shotgun approach, scatter these precious resources under the Safe Streets Act, all over the suburban and rural landscape where the problems of crime cannot be compared to the desperate urgency of crime in our cities.

If the Governors and the State legislators will not help the cities improve their law enforcement systems with available Federal funds, how in the world can we sit here and honestly tell the American people that the Governors and their rurally oriented legislators are going to deal more fairly with cities on the sensitive and controversial problems of urban poverty.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question that has been of great concern to me in my district, and that is the harsh application of the means test to individual families

living in a poverty area served by a community-based health service center. Let me explain.

The poverty legislation has made possible a fundamental change in the philosophy and organization of health services. Instead of "charity" of the poor, medical care would be theirs by right. Instead of the hospital clinic, the "neighborhood health center" would be the source of care. Instead of crisis medical care, continuous, high quality, comprehensive, and above all, dignified medical and social care would be provided.

These centers were to be in fact, as well as in theory, the neighborhood's health center. Each center would be located in, and limit its service to, a well-defined community. By limiting the number of potential patients in this way, comprehensive and preventive care could become a reality. To insure the center's responsiveness to the community, four things were to be done. First, community residents would be hired or trained to fill jobs in the center, both in the provision of care and in administration. Second, a community advisory board made up of elected community representatives would take an active part in setting the policies of the center. Third, besides medical care, other social services such as job training and legal assistance would be provided. And finally, and most importantly, the only requirement for free care at the center would be residence within the community. There were two reasons for this: first, it would remove an important barrier to care, and second, it would not divide the community along financial, and therefore class, lines.

The Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Health Center—MLK—is one of these OEO centers. It opened in 1966 to serve a low-income area in the south Bronx, the neighborhood I represent. While it is difficult to measure results after so short a period, some indications of success are available.

More than half of the families of the area, about 28,000 people, are registered at the center, making it the largest participant organization in its community.

More than 300 community residents have been trained at the center and placed in jobs in the center or in other health agencies. Many residents have also been hired directly into jobs in the center.

An advisory board made up of 21 elected community residents has been formed and is now taking an active part in setting the policies of the center.

The health advocacy department has provided advice and assistance in helping community residents secure their legal rights.

While research is still being done on how best to measure the center's effect on the health status of the community, one index, infant mortality, may be indicative. In 1967 the infant mortality rate of the community ranged from 19.4 to 41 per thousand, depending on the area of the community in which the mother lived. Now, among mothers who have received prenatal care at the center, the infant mortality rate is only 4 per thousand.

These successes are clear evidence of the soundness of the principles behind the original OEO program. After decades of failure in providing medical care as charity, the provision of care as a right has proven to be effective.

Mr. Chairman, these successes are now being threatened. In 1967 Congress amended the original OEO legislation. This amendment required all centers to make a determination of eligibility with their patients, but it did not explicitly require any particular form of eligibility test. The OEO general counsel, however, is now requiring all centers to implement a means test, and to charge a fee for service to all people with incomes above the State Medicaid guidelines.

The implementation of a means test and fee schedule is a complete betrayal of the principles behind the intent of Congress in passing the OEO legislation, and a return to the charity concept of medical care. Once such a betrayal is implemented, the successes of the program will be lost.

All OEO centers have fought the implementation of a means test and fee schedule, however, one by one, they have all capitulated.

The primary objection of the center against the means test is that it forces the center to humiliate its patients. Any person forced to submit to a means test is well aware that the care he receives is not being provided to him as his right, but through the benevolence, the noblesse oblige, of more deserving citizens. It makes it explicitly clear that if he wants medical care he must prove, to the administrators' satisfaction, that he is poor enough, by the administrators' standards, to receive free medical care. No matter how carefully worded, no matter how conscientiously administered, a means test remains a means test, an affront to the dignity of the patient.

The second objection is to the effective abandonment of the "neighborhood health center" concept that all residents be treated equally. This principle would be violated by the introduction of a means test and fee schedule.

The introduction of a means test and fee schedule will force the center to divide the community arbitrarily into two groups, those who pay and those who do not. Once this is done the center will no longer provide equal care to all patients. The impossibility of separate but equal care has been documented time and time again. Once distinctions are made between classes of patients, separate classes of medical care arise. A "neighborhood health center" has no mystical aura that can prevent this. It can only be prevented by not making such distinctions.

The third objection of the center is related to recent changes in Medicaid. When the center first began operation, the majority of community residents had incomes lower than the State Medicaid poverty guidelines, and had the choice of receiving free medical care from the center or from other sources. These conditions have now changed. Many more community residents have incomes above the State guidelines. This, of course, is not because their incomes rose, but be-

cause the guidelines were lowered, and in no way does this indicate any increase in the buying power of the community for health services. The near poor, as well as the poor, still find adequate health services too expensive to buy on the open market. They would be forced to use the center, with its new fee schedule, as their primary source of care. Thus, the net effect would be to make medical care more expensive for the near-poor, without giving them any new services.

The fourth objection of the center is directed against the great inequities in the availability of care that would be caused by the introduction of a means test and fee schedule. For example, under the grant conditions the center has received from OEO, free medical care could still be provided to families living in the low-income housing projects within the area, even though their incomes are above the Medicaid guidelines. However, the center could not provide free care to families with the same incomes and who are eligible to live in the projects, but who are not actually living in them. Most of these families live in the tenement section of the area which has a significantly higher infant mortality rate than the housing projects, and who pay much more rent for slum quarters than families in the housing projects pay for their far superior accommodations. These are the very families who most need free medical care.

The final objection stems from the lack of any substantial financial benefit that would come from the introduction of a fee schedule, as indicated by the experience of other local hospitals in the area, the OEO guidelines, and the center's own fee schedule proposal. The center has estimated that after the cost of collection, the center would only collect \$22,500 per year toward an annual budget of \$6.5 million. Such an insignificant revenue makes it clear that the basic effect of a means test, like the poor laws from which it sprang, is only to humiliate the recipient of care.

Should the means test and fee schedule be implemented, the effect on the operation of the center is easy to predict. The humiliation of the means test, the hostility engendered by the betrayal of the original promises, and the inequities in charges, will cause many to stay away from the center. Many of the near-poor residents of the community, who have often acted as important trend setters, will no longer come to the center; they will find the charges too expensive. The inevitable cycle which has caused "care for the poor" to become "poor care" will again be set in motion. The bright promise of medical care as a right for all will again be eclipsed by the return to the medieval concept of charity care for the poor.

I would like to state that the Senate has considered this problem, and has expressed itself unmistakably on the subject.

I would like to read from page 25 of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee report on the OEO bill of October 10 and ask the gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of

the Education and Labor Committee, if its language is not in truth likewise the intent of the House?

The Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 provided that health services funded by OEO grants are to be made readily accessible to low-income residents of poverty areas. That language should not be construed to exclude residents of the area who have need of such assistance even though their incomes are not below the poverty level. In determining the location of such services, primary concern must be given to providing ready access in such services for those who are poor, but individual eligibility for such services should not be restricted by a strict means test.

Mr. PERKINS. That was the intent in 1967, and in the future OEO administrators should follow that intent. We never intended that persons in need of health services who live in a poverty area be denied such services solely because their incomes exceed the poverty level.

Mr. SCHEUER. That is the intent, then, of Congress.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the 5 minutes remaining to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge passage of the bill in its present form. Like virtually every other Member of this body, there are changes I would like to have seen made. In fact, some time ago I introduced my own poverty bill—H.R. 14502—with 24 cosponsors which would have added over \$250 million in earmarked authorizations for this fiscal year, over \$700 million for fiscal year 1971, and would have provided for numerous substantive changes. Nevertheless, when substantial increases were added in committee for the New Careers, Headstart, and emergency food and medical services programs, I did not press further for my own legislation.

In regard to the committee action, I would like to add two points. First, I would like to commend in strongest possible terms the work of my distinguished chairman on this bill. Those of us vitally interested in a meaningful poverty program know the great lengths to which our chairman went in an attempt to preserve the basic integrity of this legislation. Whatever happens to this bill we should all be proud of the job he has done. Second, I would like to express my regret that some members of our committee saw fit to bypass the committee with their suggested amendments and bring them up directly on the floor. Those of us interested in strengthening the bill were willing to hear the comments and face the judgment of our distinguished colleagues in committee, and I only think it would have only been fair for those wishing to dilute the bill to have done likewise. While I in no way doubt that my committee colleagues on both sides of the aisle will be offering their amendments in what they perceive as the best interests of OEO, nevertheless, I cannot believe that their suggestions would not have benefited from committee consideration.

Now I would just like to comment on two programs at OEO in which I have a particular interest.

The first is the legal services program.

Within just 3 years, LSP has developed into one of the finest, if not the finest of OEO's programs. During the past fiscal year, over 1,800 legal services lawyers handled over 610,000 civil cases for those who otherwise would have been without legal redress. The money it has returned to the poor in winning 70 percent of those cases has exceeded the cost of the program manifold. Moreover, LSP has captured the imagination of the young, socially conscious lawyers now emerging from our Nation's law schools. Their highly successful Reginald Heber Smith fellowship program has been virtually crushed with top-caliber applicants during the past 2 years.

This success has been possible chiefly because the lawyers in the 850 legal services offices have not only understood and sympathized with the legal problems of the poor, but because they have been afforded that flexibility of professional judgment in litigating their cases that is required by the American Bar Association canons of ethics. It is my understanding that several amendments will be offered to this bill which would result in limiting that flexibility.

I would implore my colleagues to heed the advice of the ABA, the National Commission on Violence, and the National Conference of Federal Court Judges, and reject these attempts, and remind them of the words of the late President Kennedy:

Those who make peaceful change impossible, make violent change inevitable.

The other OEO program which I understand is to come under attack is the economic development section. Acceptance of any of these amendments would be equally unwise. President Nixon reflected his confidence in this program earlier in the year when he transferred administration of all title I-D development funds from the Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments to OEO. He also recommended a substantial increase in funding. It is understandable why the President did this, for the OEO economic development program is probably the ultimate manifestation of the basic underlying philosophy of the poverty program—helping people help themselves.

The impact of the program is well known to me, since one of the first and largest economic development grants was made to the Hough Development Corp. in Cleveland. Since that grant was made in the spring of 1968, Hough Development has become a nationwide example of minority enterprise at its best, and serves as a model for the proliferating number of community development corporations throughout the Nation. More importantly, HDC and the multi-faceted businesses it is developing in Cleveland inner city is a symbol of hope to the many hundreds of residents of that area who had begun to lose faith in the American free enterprise system, and opportunity for the poor in our affluent society. This hope can be, and is being, replicated in urban areas all across the country. But it cannot be done if the kinds of crippling amendments I have heard discussed become law. They must be defeated—not to do so would be more than

unfortunate, it would be a disgrace to this Nation.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, in 1964 we committed our national resources to the fight against poverty. I doubt if anyone in this Chamber was naive enough to believe it could be accomplished quickly or without controversy. We perhaps have had too much of the latter. And for some I am certain the program has moved too quickly, while others will maintain it has hardly moved at all.

I personally believe that the program has made substantial progress. In my own area, and throughout the Nation, millions of disadvantaged Americans have been serviced, and have had a chance to participate in a system formerly cold and remote. Although some of the programs have been failures more have succeeded.

Headstart has had a demonstrated impact in almost every section of the country. Upward Bound has given opportunity and hope to thousands of disadvantaged youngsters. Operation Mainstream and New Careers have proven to be two of the most effective job training programs being offered. The emergency food and clothing programs have been of direct aid to literally hundreds of thousands. The community action program, often controversial, has nevertheless had a positive impact. Hundreds of imaginative and important programs are being run at CAP neighborhood centers. Language labs, teen centers, recreational facilities, baby care, budget planning are just a few of the positive efforts now being carried on.

The legal services provided through the OEO have written a new chapter in the American attempt to obtain "justice for all." For many Americans, the exercise of their legal rights, or even the protection of those rights, was little more than middle class rhetoric. To the poor, justice was a rare commodity that could only be purchased at premium prices. It was never available when they were being exploited, and seemed to always protect the perpetrators of the exploitation.

We all can be proud of the fact that this situation has started to change. The poor are learning that justice can be applied equally. The fact that the poor have rights and can now exercise them has angered some. This was to be expected. If it did not happen the program would be worthless.

Now, I certainly do not want to be characterized as looking at the war on poverty through rose-colored glasses. The program has serious difficulties. Some preconceived concepts were impossible to implement. There has been scandalous misappropriations, and malfeasance. Unfortunately, human institutions cannot be perfectly insulated from human frailties.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has shown itself particularly vulnerable to these problems. Perhaps because so much was expected so quickly, and perhaps because there is so little real understanding of the nature of the undertaking, some projects easily fell prey to corrupt and highly questionable practices. No one should have to justify

or defend this. It is indefensible and where perpetrated, must be stopped. But these instances should not be exploited and used as the handmaidens to dismantle and destroy an immensely valuable and successful program.

Born in fanfare and controversy, this program, almost more than any other Government effort, has operated in the public glare. Constant media exposure to every controversy has made the very image of OEO controversial. The controversy never abates, the heat never subsides, and as a result an accurate perspective of the program rarely if ever emerges.

This, perhaps, is the saddest fact of the war on poverty. Hardly anyone can discuss it dispassionately. For many, its image has been reduced to scandalous giveaway boondoggle. And for many others, it is the passionate savior of the downtrodden. For some it is a political instrument to obtain power or to keep others from obtaining it.

All who fall into those just mentioned categories are wrong. The Economic Opportunities Act is an honest commitment of our national resources to the challenge of overcoming the blight of poverty in the world's richest nation. Because we neglected this problem for so long, we are now groping with various methods to funnel those resources to where they will do the most good. "Groping" is the proper word. We are not entirely sure how to do it—but we are committed to eliminating poverty. And while some of our groping has been misdirected, most of our efforts have had a meaningful impact.

The program must be allowed to continue. There will be mistakes in the future as there have been in the past. There will continue to be controversy. But on the whole, the accomplishments will outweigh both the mistakes and the controversy. It is with these accomplishments and what is yet to be accomplished that we must concern ourselves.

Unfortunately, many in this Chamber are more concerned with the false images of the program than with its substance. And in an attempt to deal only with the image they will sacrifice the substance.

Two crippling amendments will be introduced. Both amendments dismantle the structure and essence of the EOA.

By far the most dangerous amendment will be the one offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE). Their amendment will effectively destroy the central thrust of the OEO and create 50 State programs of dubious value. Their amendment would guarantee that resources would not be funneled to where they are needed and insure that every State would only be able to do as little as possible.

If the amendment passes, there would no longer be a national program. About the only function left to the Director of OEO will be to defend himself in court against lawsuits filed by the various States if he dares disapprove of their programs.

One of the most important and vital elements of the present program is its ability to muster and concentrate national resources where they are critically

needed. When you have limited resources that must be applied to a massive problem, it is essential that a central authority have the ability to act. This ability to act will be crushed by the Green-Quie amendment.

We can look forward to the program moving in 50 different directions if the amendment passes. States that do not have sophisticated machinery to implement a program will require their poor to remain in limbo until they get around to establishing the necessary institutions. Programs will be completely subject to the ever-changing whims of 50 different administrations. National purpose, direction, and commitment will dwindle as each State program becomes increasingly embroiled in the vagaries of local politics.

What is so ironic about this amendment at this time is that the Director of OEO has specifically outlined 15 steps to strengthen the State role in the program. The President's Director offers a reasonable and working partnership with the States. The Green-Quie amendment destroys the partnership relation.

A second amendment, equally as onerous, is slated for introduction. The Murphy amendment would permit State Governors to veto any legal service program funded in his State. Every lawyer should realize the implication of this. It politicizes the lawyer-client relationship. It permits the Governor to decide whether certain suits should be undertaken or quashed. It completely distorts the principle of equal administration of the law. An arbitrary Governor could easily utilize this tool for his own political purposes.

Almost every legal expert with a conscience has voiced his opposition to this ill-conceived and dangerous amendment. Virtually every law school dean and professor in my area has written asking me to vote against this amendment. My mail has been filled with warnings from leading attorneys throughout the State of California about the very real dangers of the Murphy amendment. The House must reject this pitiful attempt to subject the legal rights of the poor to the whims of the politicians. It is unconscionable.

These two amendments, taken together, represent the most serious challenge to our commitment to eradicate poverty since the program was initiated in 1964. If they pass, there will no longer be a program. We will go through the motions, but the heart and substance will no longer exist.

It makes no sense to tear down the program when it is operating successfully. Such wasteful and callous destruction will not enhance one bit our ability to overcome poverty. But it will do tremendous damage. The very tenuous and delicate confidences created in these past 5 years between an affluent establishment and the alienated and discontented poor will be irreparably damaged. The waste in resources and successfully operating organizations will be far more costly than any promised economies resulting from such changes.

I have been terribly disappointed with the White House vacillating leadership

on this issue. The President proposed a 2-year extension of the program as it is—but has yet to insist that his legislative leadership adopt his position. If anything, he has avoided supporting his administration's position.

There is no question about my stand. I support the President's request to extend the EOA for 2 years without major changes. I intend to vote for the bill as it was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, we are asked here to choose between Federal control and State control of the Office of Economic Opportunity programs. As one who believes, in general, that the necessary functions of government are best kept as close as possible to the people, I would normally find no difficulty in making this choice. I would vote for State control.

There are some programs, however, that simply do not lend themselves to efficient and effective management by government at any level. I refer to programs like medicaid, which has been poorly administered by many State governments, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, which has been poorly administered by the Federal Government. Programs such as these require a large degree of involvement of the private sector, and their success is proportionate to the amount of that involvement.

I think the administrative and operational controls of OEO programs should be vested in a body outside the political structures of either the State or Federal governments. And for this reason I will vote against the amendment.

In so doing, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues and of the administration to an alternate method of structuring the Office of Economic Opportunity programs at the State level. It is a method that has proven workable, efficient, and productive in New Mexico, and I believe it provides a model answer to the OEO's problems in administration and control.

I refer to the home education livelihood program—HELP—which has been operating as the New Mexico "delivery system," if you will, of the special impact and migrant sections of the OEO Act for the past 2 years.

It is unique among all the programs funded by OEO in that it is sponsored in our State by the New Mexico Council of Churches. Its board of directors consists of 12 representatives appointed by the council and six farmworkers representing the rural areas served by the program.

In addition to the State board of directors, HELP programs are administered through 50 community centers throughout the State, with each center operated by a local community HELP council.

Basic funding of this program is a mixture of Federal and private money, with \$1.7 million funded under sections I-D and III-B of the OEO Act and \$800,000 provided from private sources. Control of the funds and administration of the programs is the responsibility of the board of directors, operating through a paid staff in Albuquerque.

The HELP programs center on three basic problems in New Mexico: Housing, adult education, and economic development. Its success in each of these fields has been outstanding. In housing alone, 150 families have been assisted in obtaining new homes which they built with the help of their neighbors and with money loaned by the HELP program. Each homeowner acquired a "sweat equity" in his house through his own labor, and repayment of the loans is geared to the family income.

In adult education, more than 4,000 seasonal and migrant workers have attended classes in the 50 community centers, and 1,200 children have been enrolled in the child care and development program. These workers are trained in mechanics, carpentry, welding, home economics, basic education, or general education development. It is significant that during the 2 years the program has operated, these migrant and seasonal workers formed six credit unions with \$25,000 in assets. Further, they have conducted book drives and solicited donations for the establishment of community libraries in rural areas which have never had a library outside of the local schools. Six such libraries have been established without cost to the Federal Government.

The real showcase of the HELP program, however, is in its success in economic development in the rural areas it serves.

Mr. Chairman, this program has succeeded in helping rural people to help themselves far better than any such program in the Nation and at less per capita cost to the Government. Its record is unparalleled in helping seasonal and migrant workers first to learn a trade or skill and then to form a company among themselves to utilize those trades or skills in the production and marketing of salable items.

I have worked closely with this organization and have been personally involved with it in the development of many privately owned, privately operated, rural-oriented small industries in our State. Poor people have formed companies to produce hand-carved furniture which today commands top prices and is in great demand throughout the country. Other industries we have helped get started include weaving shops, a machine shop, a plant to manufacture doors, signs, toys, and other wood products, wearing apparel plants and numerous farm marketing co-ops, including a fruit marketing co-op that is breathing new life into the apple industry that has been dying for 20 years in New Mexico.

And on a larger scale, the HELP organization has been largely responsible for the establishment of a huge network of cattle feedlot operations in New Mexico which involve more than 3,000 small ranchers and will add more than \$5 million to the State's economy.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is that this semipublic organization, working with a combination of Federal and private money, has succeeded fantastically where so many other OEO-funded programs have failed. It provides an example to the rest of the Nation—and the

Office of Economic Opportunity itself—of what can be done with this money under an administrative and operational structure that involves the people and the communities in programs to help themselves.

I strongly suggest that the Office of Economic Opportunity study this example and consider this form of organizational structure as the type of administrative vehicle through which to channel its funds and programs.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to add my voice to those of my colleagues who have risen in support of H.R. 12321, the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. I support this bill with enthusiasm and without reservations. H.R. 12321 extends the Office of Economic Opportunity for 2 years; it maintains those of its programs that have proved useful and strengthens those for which the greatest need has developed. By putting increased emphasis on programs which have proved their efficacy in lifting people out of the conditions that accompany low-income living, the bill has turned its back neither on the poor nor on those in the Government who have called for a judicious dispersal of poverty funds. It is altogether a reasonable and responsible piece of legislation which, in my opinion, holds out the best hope for continuing to help the poor in a meaningful way. In commending this bill, I salute the man most responsible for it, the wise and extraordinarily able chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, about whose wholehearted commitment to aid the poor there has never been any doubt.

H.R. 12321 extends the Office of Economic Opportunity for 2 years, in order to allow for long-range planning of programs and for an efficient allocation of funds. It also adds three new titles to the Act, two of which strengthen successful programs, and the third of which comes squarely to grips with the very serious problems of hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

The first of the new titles revises title I of the act by removing the New Careers and Operation Mainstream programs from part B and incorporating them into a new part E. These two programs have shown themselves to be unusually effective in achieving their job creation and work-training goals; the first in meeting the serious shortages of manpower in the area of services and the second in providing work-experience for chronically unemployed adults. The bill earmarks a total of \$110 million for these two programs, an increase over the administration's request that is clearly justified by the fact that present economic trends indicate that the unemployment rate may well go even higher than its already unacceptable level.

H.R. 12321 also adds a new title IX to the Economic Opportunity Act, in which the continuation of both Project Headstart and Follow Through is specifically authorized. In making this change, the committee has recognized that "the early years of childhood are the most critical in growth and development" and that support for these programs—which have so effectively promoted the early

development of poor children—must be emphasized and increased. Accordingly, the new title IX authorizes \$578 million for Headstart and Follow Through—\$458 million for Headstart and \$120 million for Follow Through—which would provide program services for up to twice as many low-income children as would the figures proposed by the administration. The language in the new title IX would allow both the refunding of existing Headstart and Follow Through projects as well as the funding of new ones, and the training, technical assistance, and research and evaluation activities in support of the programs are also continued by the proposed legislation.

Perhaps the most urgently needed section in the bill is that which creates the new intensive programs to eliminate hunger and malnutrition. During the past few years, we have all been shocked and dismayed to learn of the existence of poverty-related hunger and malnutrition in the richest, most agriculturally abundant Nation in the world. We have learned that millions of poor Americans do not have incomes adequate to obtain nutritious diets, and that our Federal food assistance efforts have fallen far short of the need. The Committee on Education and Labor, and its chairman, were determined to enable the Office of Economic Opportunity—with its unmatched network of local involvement agencies—to expand the fight against hunger and malnutrition-related disease begun in 1968 under the emergency food and medical services program. During the short time it has been in operation, the emergency food and medical services program has done an excellent job with the resources it has had available, but there can be no doubt that those resources have been much too limited to allow for a full-scale attack on hunger.

In recognition both of the value of the emergency food and medical services program experience and of the evident need for more consequential efforts in this area, H.R. 12321 adds a new title X to the Economic Opportunity Act which gives the Office of Economic Opportunity broad authority to provide financial assistance for medical supplies and services, nutritional foodstuffs, and related services to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. Specific emphasis is placed by the bill on aiding the elderly and the very young—two groups from whom malnutrition and undernutrition exacts a heavy price. The authorization for these intensive programs to eliminate hunger and malnutrition is \$92 million for fiscal 1970, which is an increase of \$62 million over what was proposed in the administration budget. In my view there can be no question but that this money will be wisely spent in support of the programs of the new title X proposed in H.R. 12321.

In reviewing the bill as a whole—and noting that it authorizes a total of \$2,343,000,000 for fiscal 1970, as compared to the administration's budget estimate of \$2,048,000,000 for the same period of time—I can say once more with complete assurance that this would be money wisely spent. The program of the Office of Economic Opportunity have

been in existence for a mere 5 years. Some of those programs have been universally acknowledged as beneficial; all of them have in some way become part of the lives—and a main ingredient in the hopes—of the poor. I believe that we must not only continue our 5-year-old commitment to the poor by extending the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but that we must pledge ourselves anew to the elimination of poverty and its attendant inequalities. This we will help to do if we pass H.R. 12321.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, one program funded by the OEO and administered by the U.S. Department of Labor is the Green Thumb program. This program is sponsored by the Farmers Union, and I wholeheartedly endorse it.

Green Thumb employs older, low-income rural men in public projects. These activities include conservation, beautification, and recreation. Their performance has been hailed by local and State officials as being one of the best projects ever undertaken by the Federal Government both in providing benefits to those who participate in the program and heretofore unobtainable services to our communities. In southern Indiana they have made it possible for small cities and communities to have their own parks and playgrounds. They have created baseball fields for little leaguers, erected fencing to keep children safe on the playground, built picnic and rest areas and have beautified our roadsides. These are just a few of the things they have been able to accomplish in our small communities.

I am especially impressed by how much the Green Thumb project has meant to those who have participated in it. Last year alone, 178 men were employed in my district, receiving wages and benefits totaling nearly \$160,000.

They make valuable contributions to their communities. I would like to quote from a letter written to me by Mr. Russell Thomas, park superintendent at North Vernon, Ind.:

Their work has been as skillful as any that could have been provided by our local building contractors. The men, while working only three days a week, worked diligently; they had a great spirit of comradeship; and they were justly proud of their accomplishments.

This is what Green Thumb is all about in southern Indiana—an income, pride, dignity, public service. It needs to be continued and expanded to accommodate the long list of eligible men who need this employment.

I strongly urge the allocation of sufficient funds to Operation Mainstream to make this possible. It is hoped an additional 36 jobs would be available to low-income elderly citizens in my district. This would mean around \$57,000 in wages, so desperately needed by individuals whose annual income averages \$860. But even more than that, it offers hope and a sense of belonging to these older citizens.

If I may, I would like to include, for the RECORD, an article from an Indianapolis paper, the News, dated October 31, 1969, for the perusal of the Members:

GREEN THUMB PROJECT HELPS PRIDE GROW
(By John Carpenter)

They come from families with an average yearly income of \$860—the oldest a 90-year-old man from rural Deputy.

Indiana Green Thumb Project, a public service program for the elderly in rural America, gives aged people with low incomes an opportunity for rehabilitation and employment.

The state's Green Thumb program has had its headquarters in Seymour since it started in July, 1966. Indiana was one of five states in the initial plan.

Part of the Manpower Act with the Office of Economic Opportunity the program has expanded from an original 10-county area to 21 counties involving 282 elderly people in the state.

About \$600,000 in funds was administered out of Washington for Indiana's part in the program this year.

A \$1,500 TOP SALARY

Average age of the workers is 67, and they work three days a week, eight hours a day, for a Federal minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour. Persons employed in Green Thumb are paid every two weeks and the most they can make in a year is \$1,500.

Why the name Green Thumb?

The program grew out of the rural beautification program and includes all kinds of hand labor jobs.

Employees, all men, work for the state, city and county highway departments and park departments among other things, and build shelter houses and Little League dug-outs, improve camping grounds, plant seedlings and transplant trees in parks and along highways, and paint guard rails.

The oldest employee in Green Thumb is Garrett Gibson, rural Deputy. He is working with a crew of six other men in Clifty Falls State Park.

"I am proud to be employed with Green Thumb and fortunate, too. I feel better working than just lying around, and the checks help me to buy medicine for my wife. I look forward to going to work and enjoy being with the other men," Gibson said in a letter sent to the Seymour headquarters.

HE DOES EVERYTHING

Wayne Vance, who has been project director of the program since it began in Indiana, said Gibson is typical of the type of persons employed by Green Thumb.

"He does everything the other employees do. He paints, helps build shelter houses and even uses an axe," Vance said.

A 63-year-old Greene County man employed in Green Thumb told a supervisor, "My family (which includes three children living at home) and I really appreciate what you are doing for us, and with the pay we are able to have three decent meals a day."

Vance, 30, said his staff consists of an assistant director, two supervisors, a secretary and an office staff bookkeeper.

He said the program has:

- (1) Aided nearly 300 elderly men and their families who badly need jobs to help themselves financially.
- (2) Proved to the people there are critical employment problems in rural areas.
- (3) Proved senior citizens are not particularly happy or content to sit down and start drawing social security money.
- (4) Brought out new skills in individuals.
- (5) Proved many elderly people want to be gainfully employed.
- (6) Helped give people the opportunity to live rather than just barely exist.

NEED AND HEALTH STUDIED

Older, retired low-income citizens are hired on the basis of need and physical condition. People are screened by an employment service and are interviewed by officials of the organization for the 21-county area.

Vance said there are more than 200 applications for jobs on file in his office.

He has asked for 350 job slots in 1970.

"The total objective of the program is to get people back to work and move some of them out to private enterprise—with some taking full-time jobs," Vance said.

Counties now included in the program are: Jennings, Posey, Jackson, Pike, Orange, Brown, Jefferson, Dubois, Floyd, Martin, Knox, Greene, Bartholomew, Gibson, Washington, Warrick, Scott, Clark, Lawrence, Davless, Sullivan.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Economic Opportunity Act as reported by the committee.

While operating since last July under a continuing resolution, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been undergoing what seems to me to be a significant transition from what it was 1 or 2 years ago to what it is now and, more importantly, what it can be in the years ahead.

It is not necessary for me to catalog the shortcomings, the misdirected efforts, the noisy irritations, and the wasted money. Far more important, I submit, where the positive accomplishments of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the more than 950 local community action agencies, the 49 comprehensive health centers, the neighborhood legal assistance offices, the VISTA volunteers, the family planning centers, the support of cooperative business enterprises—all of which are built in to the on-going Office of Economic Opportunity program for the future.

Instead of dwelling on errors of the past, it is more useful to remind ourselves of positive accomplishments that have taken place as foundations for future progress. What are these achievements of the Office of Economic Opportunity? Let me mention a few:

It made the country aware of the scope, the depth, and severity of the blight of poverty.

It helped make clear how vast is the range of what we do not yet know, and how fragile are projections based on partial knowledge.

It taught lessons about what works and what does not work in combating poverty problems.

It demonstrated the value of having within the Federal Government an agency whose special concern is the victims of economic hardship.

It dramatized the need for flexibility, responsiveness, and continuing innovation in efforts to cope with the root causes of poverty.

It brought out the needs for management effectiveness.

It revealed that the Office of Economic Opportunity's greatest value and potential comes from its work as an initiating agency, devising new programs to help the poor help themselves, and serving as an incubator for those programs during their initial phases.

OEO Director Rumsfeld has now increased the dimensions of the Office of Economic Opportunity, adding new responsibilities to those that already exist in carrying forward its operational programs.

Through its new offices of Program Development and Planning, Research,

and Evaluation, the OEO is now addressing itself to such unanswered and difficult questions as these: What determines an individual's capacity for growth and achievement? What can be done to awaken that capacity and develop it? How can we be sure that these capabilities, when they are available, will be fully used and properly rewarded?

Not until our Nation comes to grips with questions such as these, and comes up with workable answers, will real inroads be made on the ills of poverty. This is why the kind of research and study being undertaken by the Office of Economic Opportunity represents a vitally important investment of Federal funds.

Moreover, the Office of Economic Opportunity will concentrate emphasis on ways and means of similarly altering the attention and thrust of a broad range of public and private institutions, to revitalize their approaches to problems of poverty. For this reason the OEO office of Program Development will try out a wide variety of new ideas, test them fully in theory and practice, and then encourage other appropriate agencies and organizations to carry out the practical applications resulting from this experimental process.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity has established more precise standards for measuring performance than the agency has used in the past. Creation of the agency's Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation gives the Government an exceedingly valuable capability to assess Office of Economic Opportunity programs and the efforts of other organizations as well—a capacity based on independent, scientific analysis, and one that has been needed for a long time.

I am convinced that the Office of Economic Opportunity is on the right track. It has a critically important job to do and is gearing up well to perform it. What is urgently required now, of course, is prompt action to approve a 2-year extension of the Office of Economic Opportunity without crippling amendments such as the Green-Quee substitute.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Chairman, just as all of us can agree on the value of volunteerism in working toward solution of our Nation's social problems, so we should all agree on the increasingly more important contributions being made by the Volunteers in Service to America, or VISTA, program.

One criterion as to the effectiveness of this program is the demand for it. In this regard, it should be pointed out that despite efforts to discourage requests which cannot be met, VISTA has requests from local communities for approximately five times the number of volunteers which the current budget will support.

A second criterion as to the value of this program is the extent to which it represents an opportunity for Americans to help each other. In this regard, it should be noted that a recent Gallup poll demonstrates that 56 percent of all university students—over 3 million young Americans—are interested in VISTA service. In another poll, three out of every four parents stated that they would like to have their son serve in

VISTA. Nearly 20,000 men and women have served, or are currently serving, in VISTA. The number of inquiries regarding VISTA service has increased by 19 percent this fiscal year, and more than 93,000 persons have now applied for this program.

A third criterion regarding VISTA should be the quality of its volunteers. During fiscal 1969, 49 percent of the volunteers selected were college graduates. During fiscal 1970, this figure jumped to 73 percent. Forty-four percent of all volunteers this fiscal year possess professional skills, and 30 percent of the volunteers will be using these skills as VISTA specialists. At the same time, VISTA has been increasingly successful in recruiting volunteers who are themselves from poor communities, and who have the potential to be highly effective in working with our citizens who are in similar circumstances.

The final, and most important criterion of VISTA's effectiveness must be the programs themselves. Since VISTA began its intensive evaluation in the spring of 1968, some 200 weak projects have been closed or restructured. Supervision activities have been greatly increased. Skilled volunteers are increasingly being teamed with volunteers from poverty communities. New VISTA projects have greater concentrations of volunteers for greater impact.

VISTA presently has over 6,000 volunteers in the field. If 50 separate State programs were created, administrative costs would be vastly increased. The skills of VISTA volunteers are not evenly distributed, and most of the potential volunteers are located in the larger and more populous States. If separate programs were created, the States would have to recruit either within their own boundaries, to the disadvantage of the smaller States, or there would be a proliferation of visits by recruiters from different States seeking volunteers from the same populous areas. Training costs would be vastly increased in a similar manner.

It should be pointed out that under present programs, volunteers may not be assigned to a State without the written consent of that State's Governor; moreover, the Governor has the additional right to have volunteers removed at any time. To place the VISTA program under State control is not only expensive, it is unnecessary.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to indicate my support for the 2-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act, as recommended by the committee, and to state my opposition to the so-called Quie-Green-Ayres substitute proposal. In doing so I am supporting the Director of the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity, Donald Rumsfeld, who has today again reaffirmed his opposition to the substitute measure. Mr. Rumsfeld still has the support of the administration, and it is my hope that the House will defeat the substitute.

Admittedly, my position today with respect to the substitute amendment places me in a unique position—unique because I have long been on record as a strong proponent of the block grant concept, and have called for greater imple-

mentation of Federal-State revenue-sharing programs. My opposition to the substitute, which essentially employs a modified State plan approach, derives from what I regard to be serious overriding considerations which I hope every Member will carefully consider before voting today.

Certainly the "war on poverty" has, over the years, had its problems and shortcomings. I am not blind to that. But, on balance, I believe that the poverty programs have done a great deal of good. The 35 million poor Americans, and particularly the many young people among them, who are caught in the tragic grip of the city ghetto and its cycle of hopelessness deserve our best efforts on their behalf. I agree that we can, and must, do better. But I do not believe that the substitute amendment represents that best effort. I am convinced that for us to now abruptly convert an ongoing 5-year-old poverty program, which has given rise to such commendable and vital programs as legal services, Headstart, community action, and comprehensive health, among others, would create even greater problems than we are experiencing today, and would be a grave disservice to the poor people of this Nation.

There are a number of specific reasons why I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the 2-year extension as reported by the Committee.

First, only 6 months ago our former colleague, Donald Rumsfeld, took over the direction of OEO. During that short period, I have been impressed by his vigorous leadership and by the many reorganization efforts that he has already undertaken both in his own Washington office and in the regional offices.

Mr. Rumsfeld has promised to give substantially more attention to the way in which OEO policies are carried out at the local, State, and regional levels. And to carry out this latter promise, he has set up a new Office of Program Operation.

Mr. Rumsfeld in addition has promised to greatly expand State responsibility and contribution to the poverty program. And he has done more than promise; he has already, via directives, spelled out a six-step plan to implement the promise of greater State involvement.

This is not mere rhetoric. This is constructive action.

In my judgment, this is the only manner in which we can responsibly bring about the kind of increased State involvement that we all would like to see, without disrupting the beneficial aspects of the poverty program. I concur on this score with the committee which stated:

In view of the commitments made by Mr. Rumsfeld, a majority of the Committee decided it would be unwise to legislatively impose what might be better be accomplished administratively by the Director of the agency.

I strongly feel that Mr. Rumsfeld has earned the right, through his performance, to have a reasonable time to solve problems administratively before new legislative directions are considered.

But let me go on and tell you what else I believe to be seriously wrong with the proposed substitute measure.

The Office of Economic Opportunity was created in the first place because the States and the traditional Federal agencies, operating independently, were not solving the serious problems of poverty. To now encourage the setting up of "State offices of economic opportunity" and the expansion to these of substantial administrative functions would cause wholesale multiplicity of effort and unnecessary duplicate staffing throughout the country. This, I believe, would have the effect of bogging us down with an even greater administrative bureaucracy—something I thought we were trying to avoid—and at the expense of our ongoing substantive programs.

Let me give you a few examples. Legal Services, one of the most laudable Federal programs ever to have been created, is now funded at \$54 million. It is administered on a national basis by a corps of 35 staff professionals. Not only would a great deal of the budgeted money necessarily be siphoned off from program and into administrative costs, were the substitute to be adopted, but also, in my judgment, we would risk jeopardizing the effectiveness of the program.

The same is true with the comprehensive health programs, and the Follow Through—extension of Headstart—programs. The comprehensive health program is funded at \$74 million. It operates in 30 States and the District of Columbia, but yet it is administered nationally by a professional staff of 23. Follow Through is funded at \$58 million, and is administered on a national basis by 19 professional staff members.

There are yet other problems which I believe the substitute would bring about.

Many of the poverty programs, notably the community action program, are built around the concept of maximum participation by the poor. It is unfortunately doubtful whether there could be substantial, let alone maximum, participation by the many poor people who reside in our Southern States. But this presumes that one of these States has had its State plan approved. And this brings me to the next problem.

In the event that a State's plan is rejected by the Federal Director, the substitute measure provides a remedy in Federal court whereby that State can appeal the decision. Thus, because of the tortoiselike pace of case-by-case litigation, a State could use this as a device to thwart the effectiveness of poverty programs within its own borders.

I would like to point out also that the substitute measure embraces the effect of the Murphy amendment, which has already passed the Senate, and to which I am also opposed. This latter amendment would give State Governors an absolute veto power over legal services programs. While I recognize that in many States, such as in my own, in many regions of our country, this would not be a harmful tool if exercised wisely. But there are some States, where there are many poor people, where there is regrettably no guarantee that such a veto would be used wisely.

The modifications made this week in the substitute, in an effort to effect a compromise, are not enough to make it

an acceptable program. As Director Rumsfeld said today:

The end result has fallen short of what is necessary for effective management. The substance of the substitute has not been altered.

I, therefore, again urge the defeat of the so-called Quie-Green-Ayers substitute amendment, and the passage of the committee-recommended 2-year extension of OEO.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 12321. I find it amazing that any Member of this House can explain to his constituents, who only a few weeks ago were told we must continue the surtax until the President had been able to cut back on wasteful spending, why he will now cast a vote to add more billions to the \$7.7 billion we have already wasted on this collection of obnoxious Federal programs. But we are not only being asked to continue the OEO today, we are being asked to enlarge what amounts to city-style jungle training in countless back alleys and church basements across the Nation.

No one can point to a significant number of successful programs under the OEO, unless, as our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) so ably stated, the purpose of the war on poverty legislation was to foment discord in our cities and institutions.

The American people are demanding that Congress stop the wasteful spending which has forced this Nation to the brink of financial disaster. They want a good bargain for every dime we spend in their behalf.

So where do we cut, Mr. Chairman? The school lunch program? The highway construction program? No, we must cut where the waste really is—with the OEO.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is a bad bargain for America. It is a bad bargain for the poor and a bad bargain for the taxpayer.

The OEO and its web of agencies spinning off into every community in America has become a creature of black power and roistering radicalism that will hurt this Nation for generations to come unless we stamp it out.

You have difficulty in getting an Army commission with minor juvenile offenses on your record, but an arrest record as long as your right arm will qualify you for a top salary in an OEO agency. You may lose a Government job for a bad debt record, but you can work for an OEO project in a position of responsibility if you are a bad check artist or worse. You may lose a civil service pay raise unless your record is clean but you can get on the OEO dole and agitate for higher welfare payments and against "police brutality" even if you are a narcotics addict or a refugee from a criminal asylum.

The OEO community action agencies in this country have been in the hands of radicals almost from the beginning of the OEO. The neighborhood legal services attorneys have been busy taking State and local agencies into court—far too busy to take care of the legitimate legal needs of the poor. These are facts.

The papers are full of them; the television livid with them.

Mr. Chairman, every evil and diseased mind put into a position of trust and leadership with OEO funds breeds and spawns a hundred more on the street corners of America. When we tolerate the handpicking of criminals, crooks, and radicals to fight the poverty war for decent Americans we are sowing the seeds of our own destruction.

In the District of Columbia an almost endless roll can be called of those who use OEO as a springboard for promoting radicalism and un-American standards to what they want to accomplish—not what needs to be accomplished to alleviate the plight of the poor.

They take antipoverty funds in one form or another, spend much of their time arranging demonstrations, participating in demonstrations, and goading on the demonstrators to violate the law. They are almost too numerous to mention. Collectively, they set a pattern for activity and favoritism of employment that is clear to anyone who will look into the backgrounds of those in the forefront of agitation in this area.

This is not accidental. It is the direct consequence of intent and dedication to disrupt and destroy the peaceful activities we are undertaking as a government to help the poor.

No government funds, Federal, State or local, should go to those dedicated to the destruction of this Nation, whether they are serious about the game they are playing or simply playing for kicks. The same rule should apply and be enforced against those whose activities reveal a pattern of law violations.

We face enough hazards in our efforts today, without risking those which are spawned by irrational minds or from criminal intentions.

Some of my colleagues hope somehow to revise this program so as not to be charged with killing it. But the residents of my district do not agree. They are alarmed and they want me to express that alarm.

Mr. Chairman, we can cure poverty. But we cannot cure the OEO by doctoring it, pampering it, or ignoring it. We can eliminate it. We can start anew without it. And we should do so with the same speed with which it was created.

The decent people of America are concerned about the problems of poverty and are willing to make whatever sacrifice necessary to solve them. So are the Members of this Congress and the Federal and State Governments.

But the job cannot be done with endless funding, endlessly wasted. It must be done by careful planning and consistent control of the funds allocated to the various programs. This would not include the use of funds either directly or indirectly to employ agitators and rioters and give them access to cash and prestige in laying out policies in direct contravention of the wishes of Congress or the good sense of the American people.

We must look at poverty and unemployment at the same time. We must look at the countless thousands of jobs going begging, then we must help the unemployed find employment and train those who are unemployable.

OEO is a creature of Congress, Mr. Chairman. So are its mistakes, its flaws, its dangers. The consequences of its risks will also be a creature of Congress. OEO has not, will not, and cannot cure poverty. When a Government agency creates more problems than it solves it is high time Congress take a long look at what is going on. Never has the need for that long look been more urgent than it is with OEO today.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the most effective of OEO's programs has been the emergency food and medical services program. Over a million people have been helped. More than 400 programs in more than 1,000 counties in 43 States have been developed. Fifty research or demonstrated programs have been funded. But these statistics are not enough. It is prudent to ask at this point what is happening in these programs and why they exist at all.

The programs were created to allow local people to identify local problems and to develop ways to solve them. Some of the local problems are simple and obvious. Some are subtle, complex and indistinct. For example, the simple process of hiring and training a handful of outreach workers may solve the problem of the poor who do not know about the food programs or of those who are frightened or illiterate or unable to speak English. Helping them through the certification process may enable them to overcome lifelong fear of local welfare officials.

Some of the CAA's have established simple transportation systems to get people to food or food to people. This helps to solve the problem of the isolated rural poor or of the urban mother with three children and a month's supply of commodities to bring home from a surplus distribution center. In addition, many of the programs are helping families with the cost of food stamps, and for those who cannot get certified, with outright purchases of food. They are helping with school lunches with either direct assistance to the families or through arrangements with local school lunch officials. They are established educational programs in nutrition, home care and consumer affairs. And they are developing other local programs of community self-help.

Special demonstration and research programs developing new ways of getting food assistance to migrant farm workers and looking at the problem of nutrition education, its usefulness and effectiveness. In addition, OEO is working with the development of totally new ways of approaching nutrition, education and training for schoolchildren as well as for adults. It is working with school lunch people to develop new ways of improving the school lunch system.

Many of these experimental OEO projects parallel suggestions which I proposed in my testimony earlier this year before the House Agriculture Committee. Programs which attempt to aid the poor in receiving food from widely scattered, infrequently open distribution centers will do much to alleviate the problem of hunger. Nutrition education is also vitally necessary. These measures can provide interim relief while the Department of Agriculture analyzes and re-

vamps its food-aid programs to deal with nutrition deficiencies and poverty induced hunger.

As I suggested to the committee, effective food-distribution programs may ultimately depend upon the successful implementation of one or more of the following:

First, a requirement that benefits be made available uniformly throughout each participating State;

Second, discontinuance of Government warehousing of surplus food items and Government-issue packaging and utilization of private food stores as points for the distribution of items on a surplus list;

Third, utilization of private food stores for the sale of food stamps and delivery of surplus food vouchers. Supplementing the distribution of stamps and vouchers at food stores, we should provide those who are in poverty and regularly receiving monthly Government or retirement checks—thus having a set income—with food stamps through the mail. This part of the system could thus be automated, reducing costs and allowing the concentration of our limited manpower on those whose incomes fluctuate monthly.

Fourth, a requirement that the local unit of government certify those eligible for food stamps and/or surplus distribution quarterly and in some cases at greater intervals, with vouchers or stamps issued more frequently to the poor than at present.

Fifth, permitting concurrent operation of both the food stamp and surplus distribution programs in counties. All poor people would be eligible to purchase food stamps, but those of extremely low income would also be made eligible for surplus food vouchers.

This would serve two important purposes: it would give extra free food to those who have the greatest need for it; it would create a highly flexible means of stimulating consumption of selected items that may from time to time become in heavy surplus.

Sixth, a requirement that each eligible family include at least one person with competence in food purchasing and preparation.

On October 30, the Director of OEO, Don Rumsfeld, assured me that these and other approaches to the problem of hunger and malnutrition were under active review by his office. The present emergency food and medical services program is effective, and under the new Director's guidance and innovation will become even more so. It maximizes its cost effectiveness by maximizing the utilization of other programs.

In my opinion, it deserves our continued support.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, on December 3 I intended to cast an enthusiastic vote for H.R. 12321, the Economic Opportunity Amendments as reported by the House Education and Labor Committee. I was unable to do so because of the precipitate introduction of a substitute bill, which few of my colleagues had heard about and even fewer had seen. We wanted time to study this bill, to see how it compared to H.R. 12321 in its effects on the Office of Economic Opportunity, and to determine what par-

ticular needs it answered. After having studied this substitute proposal, I announce that my vote for H.R. 12321 will be cast with an even greater awareness of its wisdom and generosity toward the poor. By voting for the Committee-reported bill, I will be reaffirming my personal commitment to promote the elimination of poverty in the world's wealthiest Nation.

H.R. 12321 would extend the legislative authority of the Economic Opportunity Act for 2 years—until the end of fiscal year 1972—just as the administration requested. This extension would allow for greater efficiency in the planning of programs and allocation of funds. It would also provide for a greater feeling of job security among those working for OEO, encouraging the employment of more workers. This bill authorizes \$1.536 billion for all OEO programs for which there are no separate authorizations provided. When we total all of the separate authorizations that appear in H.R. 12321 and add to them the general authorization, we have a total authorization figure for fiscal year 1970 of \$2.343 billion, which would be some 295 million well-spent dollars greater than the Nixon administration's fiscal budget request for the programs of OEO.

The first separate authorization in H.R. 12321 would provide \$110 million in funds for the Operation Mainstream and the New Orleans programs. The bill makes the finding—echoed by Committee witnesses and by studies and reports—that these two programs have been extraordinarily effective in achieving the goals they were designed to attain. Operation Mainstream is a job-creating and work-training program whose principal objective is to provide work-experience for chronically unemployed adults—among them many older people—who have no reasonable hope of obtaining any unsubsidized full-time employment. The New Careers program is designed to accomplish the objectives of providing job opportunities for disadvantaged persons, helping to meet the growing shortages of manpower in the area of services, and providing more effective services to those who need them most. H.R. 12321 emphasizes the usefulness of and the need for these two programs by creating a new part of the Economic Opportunity Act under which they would be specifically authorized.

Two other programs that have proven their worth to all observers are Project Headstart and Follow Through, both of which now appear in the Economic Opportunity Act as special emphasis community action programs. H.R. 12321 would change and upgrade their status by incorporating them into a new title IX and providing specific authorizations for them amounting to \$578 million—\$458 million for Headstart and \$120 million for Follow Through. H.R. 12321 acknowledges the worth of both of these programs for the development of preschool low-income children and gives OEO broad authority to continue, expand, and supplement them.

H.R. 12321 then turns its attention to the disturbing problem of hunger and malnutrition in America and provides broad authority for OEO to combat that

problem. The existence of poverty—related hunger and malnutrition in this bountiful land is a reproach to every citizen—and most particularly to everyone in any way responsible for the very inadequate Federal food assistance programs. The recent White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health acknowledged the seriousness of the problem by calling for emergency action. H.R. 12321 would add a new title X to the Economic Opportunity Act and would provide OEO with a wide range of possible weapons to use in the battle against poverty-related malnutrition and hunger. Funds under this section could be used to supplement and expand present Federal food assistance efforts, as well as to initiate new programs for the provision of food and medical supplies where needed to counteract serious conditions resulting from hunger and malnutrition. A total of \$92 million would be authorized for these intensive programs to combat hunger and malnutrition in fiscal 1970, an increase of \$62 million over what was proposed for the present OEO emergency food and medical services program by the administration for the same fiscal year.

I believe that H.R. 12321 offers the poor the best chance for continuing their climb out of the depths of poverty; it maintains those OEO programs that have become an integral part of the lives of many of the low-income citizens of this land and it emphasizes and increases and expands those programs that have shown their incalculable worth to everyone. We must not allow the Office of Economic Opportunity to be crippled by any proposal that pretends it is for the good of the poor, yet that threatens to take away from the poor what little they have, and we must guard against any attempts to give to the States veto power over programs in aid of the poor—such as the attempt to sabotage the neighborhood legal services program by establishing such State veto power. Let us reaffirm our 5-year-old promise to the poor—initiated when we passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—by promptly passing the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the minority report on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969 claims that there is no real need to expand Operation Mainstream programs and that there was no testimony before the committee to justify the approach taken in the committee bill. The Bureau of the Budget's request is to continue the program at the current level of funding.

While I am sure the minority members recognize the excellence of the Green Thumb program which is to be the largest Mainstream program, they perhaps do not realize that there would be no chance to expand Green Thumb if these amendments should be approved. To the best of my knowledge, based on information available and the splendid record of achievement, Operation Mainstream is one program that has never had any serious problems whatsoever. The \$86 million committed to this program since the outset is probably the best and soundest investment of the entire antipoverty program, along with Headstart.

I would like to submit for the record that there is a need to expand Operation Mainstream in Minnesota. Green Thumb has a waiting list of nearly 300 more than are currently employed in the program in the 18 approved Minnesota counties, and 19 additional counties have formally requested Green Thumb. We have had many requests for a senior aids program in St. Paul similar to that in Minneapolis.

I know that there are similar requests for Mainstream in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Montana, to name only a few.

These are popular programs in north-eastern Minnesota and have made invaluable contributions in nearly every community throughout the Mesabi Range and in the southern portion of my district. If we can spend money for the space program and for the SST, we surely can afford to spend a little more money to give our older people a chance to earn their way out of poverty and at the same time help improve their communities.

In conclusion, I want to commend my very good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, CARL PERKINS, on the extraordinary effort he has made to report out the best bill possible and on the outstanding legislative job he has done in shaping the antipoverty program since its very inception.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, we are engaged today in, I hope, an act of responsibility, but we will be faced with acts of irresponsibility.

In many respects today is another of the continuing trials of the American system, of whether the American system can and will meet the needs of all of its citizens, or whether in the long run by failing the minorities, it will fail totally. I support \$2.43 billion funding for a 2-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. I do not support amendments which will cripple this program.

I believe this House and this Government must be responsive to the needs of all of its citizens, not to just a favored few, who may be of the right race, class or economic status. Today we are considering legislation to aid those of our citizens, who in the past have been ignored, the poor of all races, colors, and creeds. There are some who do not believe that these people have rights, or that the Government should be responsive to their needs.

One of the amendments proposed endangers the entire Economic Opportunity Act. It would make the poverty program a State-administered agency. I disagree with that concept. State governments vary in their attitudes toward the poor, they vary in the quality of their administrators, they vary in the responsibility and responsiveness of their Governors. When we at the Federal level allocate Federal funds, collected from all of the people, then we must insure that they are spent in a fair and equitable manner across the 50 States. The war on poverty is a Federal effort. It should remain a Federal effort.

I believe we all know the pitfalls in this

particular amendment. We know why it is being offered. We must defeat it. Some of the arguments against this amendment hold equally true for another crippling amendment which I will discuss later.

We have made a national commitment to end poverty. Let us continue that commitment.

The bill as reported to this House has the specific support of President Nixon. It has the enthusiastic support of the Director of Office of Economic Opportunity, Donald Rumsfeld, a respected former Member of this House. We should pass it without amendment. The amendment proposed by Representatives GREEN, QUIE, AYRES, SHERLE, GIALMO, and WAGGONER, would defeat the purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act.

In addition Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California, has proposed an amendment, an amendment that will be considered by this House, to cripple a part of the Economic Opportunity program. This amendment would in fact eliminate the right to legal counsel for the poor.

In California legal aid programs, financed through this act, such as the Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County and the California Rural Legal Assistance have done more in a few short years to aid the poor than any other single program. Providing legal aid to the poor is controversial, and irresponsible attacks have resulted. But let us look at the accomplishments of these programs. These programs have required every county in California to provide a food stamp program for the poor. Is this irresponsible? These agencies have challenged unfair credit practices. Is this irresponsible? They have asked that the State obey its own laws. Is this irresponsible? And they have offered to the poor, the protection of the law, instead of reserving that protection for only the affluent. Is this irresponsible?

In fact that is what the Murphy amendment is all about. Should the protection of law be offered to all, or should it, as the Governor of the State of California wishes, be reserved for only the affluent? Mr. Reagan, and the men here who do his bidding, appear to believe that law and order should benefit but one class, instead of all. They are afraid that if the poor are represented and protected before the bar of justice, that their failures will be exposed.

The Murphy amendment gives Governors the right of veto over legal programs. Why should they want such a right? In the hands of the responsible Governors the right will not be exercised. In the hands of the irresponsible Governors, it will be used to eliminate any challenge to arbitrary and sometimes illegal actions.

The American system is supposed to guarantee "equal protection under the law." That guarantee does not include the words, "if the Governor agrees." Let us try to live up to our American ideals. Let us be responsible and responsive.

I believe that even the Governor of the State of California can survive, perhaps even do better, if the poor have legal representation. I urge passage of this program without crippling amendments. Only, if we meet the needs of all Ameri-

cans, can our system live up to its constitutional promises, and survive.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, in considering the Office of Economic Opportunity in the past it has become a common practice to accent the shortcomings of the agency's activities. No doubt we will hear much of the same kind of criticism today. However, I feel OEO has made significant contributions in the battle against despair and deprivation that far transcend the daily headlines that have been unfortunately associated with the war on poverty.

In particular, OEO's constructive action in two areas which I am familiar with are significant and worthy of continued congressional support. I am referring to OEO's role in implementing the model cities program, and OEO's highly successful VISTA program—Volunteers in Service to America.

Since the inception of the model cities program, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been fully committed to its objectives and has devoted significant amounts of staff time and agency funds to that program. In addition to four full-time staff members in the headquarters office, OEO has placed specialists devoted to this program in each regional office. In fact, most regions quarters office, OEO has placed specialists.

OEO has also made program design and funding commitments to the model cities program. Some of these include:

First, earmarking: This year, OEO has agreed to earmark approximately \$20 million specifically for the model cities program.

Funds will be used for a variety of programs, including Legal Services, Comprehensive Health Centers, research and demonstration projects, and technical assistance to model neighborhood residents.

Second, technical assistance funds: In addition to the funds committed for fiscal year 1970, last year OEO worked with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to fund a joint effort to provide technical assistance to model city neighborhood groups. In cooperation with HUD, the city demonstration agencies, and local government officials, OEO funded 65 cities for a total of \$4 million. These projects will permit the neighborhood residents to work in partnership with city government and with the community action agency to establish broad support for the model cities program.

Third, participation in the approval of comprehensive model cities plans: OEO has devoted enormous time and effort at both the regional and headquarters levels while participating in the review and approval of the plans developed by the citizens and local officials of individual model cities. When appropriate, OEO personnel in legal service, comprehensive health, research and demonstration, manpower, and Headstart have carefully reviewed and counseled the Department of Housing and Urban Development on the quality of the proposals.

Fourth, involvement of community action agencies: In many cities, the community action agency actively assisted city government in establishing

the original framework of the local model cities program and in getting all elements of the community involved in model cities. This cooperation between community action agencies and model cities is continuing now that the program is completing its planning and moving into establishing and operating programs.

In the coming year, OEO plans not only to continue its close association with the model cities program but to make a major effort with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to insure that community action agencies work closely together to impact the problem of urban poverty.

This positive contribution to model cities is an indication of what OEO can do at its best. We should not seek to hinder the agency in its ability to continue doing such things. Clearly, it can operate successfully under the most unstable conditions. It could do much better if we finally gave it some breathing room.

Mr. Chairman, while I am discussing some positive accomplishments of OEO in the urban area, let me mention the VISTA program and its contribution to rural areas.

It is hard to believe the last-minute airing of the proposed amendment to turn VISTA over to the States is not a deliberate attempt to kill the volunteer program. Through waste, mindless multiplication of effort, and in many States, a lack of qualified volunteer applicants, this proposed reorganization would kill a program that has effectively and peacefully brought much needed social advance.

VISTA now has seven regional training centers. The cost of operating with Federal funds, 50 separate State organizations for recruitment, selection, training and assignment of volunteers would be enormous. The result would be much waste and few benefits.

VISTA is not perfect. It is and has been one of the most effective programs designed to change the conditions of poverty in the ghettos, barrios and rural poverty areas. Over 20,000 volunteers have served, or are serving for a year, working and living with the poor. They use their skills in education, business, medical techniques, and in other fields—to help give people in poverty a chance to advance, a chance to produce, and a stake in their own communities.

President Nixon has said that only Americans can disgrace America, and he is right. But Americans who have little money, bad health, too little food, and no effective training with which to advance, have little with which to preserve their pride in themselves and their country.

Skilled VISTA volunteers have helped poor people better their lives through their own efforts. Volunteers are of all ages, but mostly they are young. Increasingly, they are skilled—in law, business, medicine, education.

Seventy-three percent of volunteers are now college graduates. By next summer 2,000 of the 6,000 volunteers in the field will be persons with professional skills—lawyers, business specialists, planners, architects, nutritionists.

Under this amendment, States most needing skilled volunteers, the rural States, the poorer States, face an impossible job if confined to recruiting within their borders. Skills are not evenly distributed. The schools that produce lawyers, business graduates, health technicians, are not evenly distributed. Skilled volunteers tend to be recruited from the more populous States. The amendment would destroy the quality of VISTA's best projects. It would not enhance local control in any meaningful way.

VISTA has learned, since its inception in 1964, that State supervision is a vital requirement for a strong program. Supervisory personnel are recruited from the local agency sponsoring VISTA. The local supervisors are required to meet high common standards. Thus, there is meaningful local control already in the program.

VISTA AND THE STATES

The proposed "substitute bill" calls for a restructuring of VISTA giving States the power to recruit, select, train and assign VISTA volunteers under grants from the Director of OEO.

VISTA, in fact, has already taken major steps in this direction through close coordination with several State governments.

For instance, in Massachusetts, 88 VISTA volunteers are assigned to the State department of community affairs, working throughout the State in programs designed by and for Massachusetts. In Alaska, VISTA volunteers are assigned to remote villages supported directly by the State. And in Puerto Rico, VESPRE—the Commonwealth's Volunteer Corps—places and supervises its own volunteers.

The Governors of the various States presently have complete control over the VISTA programs in their States at two levels:

First, prior approval of projects: Every VISTA project by legislation, including regular and associate programs, must receive Governor's approval in writing before any project can start. Although it is not required by legislation, VISTA has traditionally requested Governor's approval for its research and demonstration programs.

Second, termination during course of project: Any Governor has the legal right and authority to request the removal of any volunteer and to order the termination of any VISTA project within his State at any time during the history of the project.

It is interesting to note that during VISTA's 5-year history, only the State of Mississippi has never allowed a VISTA program within its borders, and only the Governor of Texas has requested termination of certain volunteers. These project closings represent a total volunteer strength of only 25 of the more than 20,000 volunteers who served their Nation through VISTA. A Governor's prior and retroactive veto already insures his control over VISTA projects. And the fact that only 25 out of 20,000 volunteers have been removed over a 4-year period of time indicates that the present system is working.

The proposals of the substitute amend-

ment would in fact weaken Governor's control by allowing the Director of OEO to overturn the Governor's veto of proposed VISTA placements.

Other important factors to consider: First, equitable distribution of skilled volunteers: Only a few States produce significant numbers of highly specialized volunteers such as doctors, nurses, lawyers, architects, and planners, and graduate students. In order to insure that poor people everywhere are effectively served, VISTA must distribute this rare, highly trained resource among all States based on need regardless of that State's historical ability to produce.

Second, expressed preferences for location of service: The overwhelming majority of the more than 100,000 people who have applied to be VISTA volunteers have requested assignment to locations other than their homes where they have other obligations that would interfere with full-time service of living and working with the poor.

Third, national emphasis aspect: VISTA is unique in that it represents this country's only federally financed volunteer program. VISTA has a national emphasis and a national stature that underscore the administration's commitment to volunteerism and increase VISTA's ability to recruit the most capable men and women in the Nation for public service.

Fourth, increased cost of the program at the State level: It is estimated that the unit cost of fielding a volunteer would rise twofold as each of the 50 States would be required to establish individual program development units, recruiting offices, selection divisions, and volunteer logistics and support mechanisms. As it now stands, VISTA headquarters now provides these functions on a nationwide scale, while insuring local control of volunteers by local sponsors and supervisors.

What is the point of this amendment? The inevitable result would be that fewer skilled volunteers would be used less effectively at higher costs. The programs would reach fewer poor people.

I ask you to continue VISTA as it is a successful program that grapples directly and effectively with the enormous problem of bringing Americans out of poverty.

And I urge you, my colleagues, not to emasculate the entire OEO organization. We must rise above our narrow grievances and not allow the underprivileged to lose faith in a democratic system which can truly provide solutions to their problems.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill providing for the further extension and funding of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the so-called war on poverty agency. Apparently the biggest controversy surrounding this disreputable agency is the control or lack of control by duly constituted authorities in the States and communities where its "legal aid" operations are to be conducted.

An interesting item in the local press—and one which will certainly not be carried nationally—addresses itself directly to the point raised by many responsible elected public officials. It is the height

of absurdity for the Federal Government to finance and dignify some of the irresponsible, unethical, and immoral conduct of this bevy of young lawyers. They seem to favor activities of a nature long classified as maintenance, champerty, or barratry; their lawsuits clutter the dockets of busy courts, and mislead unsuspecting people. Responsible officials rightly complain.

The District of Columbia, under a statute enacted by the Congress in 1901, has defined the crime of adultery and provided a punishment of fine and imprisonment for a year as the penalty for its commission. The criminal law of the District also provides for the prosecution of accessories as principals. Both of these criminal provisions are consonant with the generally accepted standards of good order in our society today—or at least I am unaware of any desire by any Member to repeal the law and legalize adultery.

Nevertheless, we are paying young lawyers, through the legal aid apparatus of the OEO, to advise, aid, and abet the commission of the crime of adultery in the District of Columbia. In the infamous Higgs case, both of the parties executed and filed in the district court affidavits which amount to complete confessions of having lived in open and notorious adultery for a period of years, living in such a state at the present time, and an intention to do so in the future. Their OEO-funded attorneys supervised the execution of these incriminating affidavits in the course of filing a lawsuit to require that this couple be provided public housing accommodations for their criminal liaison.

Members of the bar may be surprised to learn that a proceeding to aid the commission of a crime involving moral turpitude was brought in a court of equity.

The ultimate result is that poverty lawyers are paid by OEO with taxpayers' funds—the defendant's attorneys are the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel and Justice Department attorneys also paid by the taxpayers—the judge and all the court personnel are paid by taxpayers and since the petitioners are proceeding in forma pauperis every penny of the court cost is borne by the taxpayers.

Although the suit is still pending—prosecuted, defended, and tried at taxpayers' expense—under an OEO grant—a news item indicates that the National Capital Housing Authority has now totally capitulated to the demands for federally subsidized crime and immorality, by announcing that unmarried couples—living together in open and notorious adultery, in flagrant violation of the criminal laws of the District of Columbia—are now eligible for public housing.

For some peculiar reason, there does not appear to have been any prosecution of an open and shut criminal case against the adulterous couple, their advisers, or any question of review of the ethics of attorneys who have obviously both counseled and encouraged the commission of crime.

I insert title 22, section 301 of the District of Columbia Code and a related news clipping in my remarks:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

TITLE 22—CRIMINAL OFFENSES

Section 301. Adultery—Definition and penalty

Whoever commits adultery in the District shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both; and when the act is committed between a married woman and a man who is unmarried both parties to such act shall be deemed guilty of adultery; and when such act is committed between a married man and a woman who is unmarried, the man only shall be deemed guilty of adultery. (Mar. 3, 1901, 31 Stat. 1332, ch. 854, § 874.)

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 11, 1969]

UNMARRIED COUPLES GET HOUSING RULE

Low-income couples who are not legally married or free to marry are now eligible for public housing here under a change in National Capital Housing Authority regulations.

Washington's housing authority formerly denied admission to couples who were not formally wed or living in valid common law marriages.

The change in NCHA regulations, effected in October but not previously made public, came after an Anacostia couple who had lived together for 13 years sued NCHA for denying their housing application.

James and Beulah Higgs, who live with their seven children in a two-bedroom apartment, said they were unable to afford a divorce for Mrs. Higgs, who is still legally wed to a man she married in 1947.

The amended NCHA regulation says unmarried persons are eligible for public housing if they "give evidence of a stable relationship that has existed over a period of time."

NCHA informed the Higgs family recently that their original public housing application, filed in October, 1968, had been accepted and placed on a priority list because of their overcrowded living conditions. The couple needs a five-bedroom apartment, NCHA said.

The Higgs' antipoverty lawyers plan to continue their lawsuit, saying the new provision is vague and discriminates in favor of married couples, who do not have to prove they have a stable relationship. The Neighborhood Legal Services Program lawyers will also seek a court order requiring NCHA to notify all unwed couples previously denied admission about the change.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, as we take up the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969, I would like to rise in support of the special programs and Assistance Section of this act. I feel section 222(4) really provides the machinery and resources necessary to launch a comprehensive, concerted attack against the problems of narcotics addiction and alcoholism in areas of urban poverty.

It is already well known that addiction to opiate narcotics, dangerous drugs, and alcohol constitutes a significant and growing problem in America. However, few realize the disproportionately high incidence of addiction among the poor. Of the 190,000 narcotics addicts in this country, at least 150,000 of them are defined as "poor" under OEO guidelines.

The behavior pattern of this group of people is commonly referred to as "hard core," "antisocial," or "marginal." Repeated criminal offenses are associated with this group, and it is not surprising to find an ex-addict who turns to alcohol, a delinquent who begins taking drugs, an addict who turns to crime to support his drug habit, or a person who is dependent on both drugs and alcohol.

The life pattern of drug addicts and alcoholics in urban ghetto areas and among the rural poor is one of a progressive alienation from society, repetitious antisocial acts resulting in frequent jail terms, and a marked tendency to recidivism under our present rehabilitation programs.

Stolen property which directly relates to drug addiction or alcoholism costs this Nation several billion dollars yearly. In addition, the taxpayer on the Federal, State, and local level is faced with the incarceration costs of addicts who, by age 40, may have spent from 8 to 10 years in jail.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that too much emphasis has been placed on the "cure" rather than on finding ways to assimilate these people back into the mainstream of a productive life once they have been rehabilitated.

More emphasis needs to be placed on programs which would be designed specifically to provide specialized supportive services for employment opportunities for rehabilitated addicts. As it now stands employer resistance to these people is quite high and their job possibilities upon release from treatment are extremely difficult to find.

In my judgment, OEO is in a unique position to make a valuable contribution in the development of such a comprehensive rehabilitation program.

Section 222(4) of the act as amended provides the necessary facilities, personnel and resources to accomplish this goal, and I further understand that OEO intends to mobilize its energies and forces in this direction where narcotics addiction and alcoholism is concerned.

OEO can view the problems of poverty in perspective, as it already has widespread services and programs underway.

It has established an entree and credibility with the poor on a neighborhood level that is vital to the success of any rehabilitation effort.

I urge your support, Mr. Chairman, for the realization of this goal, and I urge all my fellow Members in the House to join with me in supporting this section of the act. Rehabilitation and assimilation is the key to the cure of these cancerous social ills. I look forward to the day when widespread addiction is no longer one of the skeletons in our closet of social ills.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago this distinguished body enacted the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Thereafter, in 1965, 1966, and again in 1967, we amended that act by adding to it provisions designed to strengthen the administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity so as to improve the efficacy of the program.

At the same time that we tightened the operating procedures of OEO, we also supported its programs by providing sufficient funds and legislative authority. And we are once again faced with the task of writing amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. Once again, the Committee on Education and Labor has reported out a bill—H.R. 12321, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969—which would amend the act by providing funds and continued legislative authority to pro-

grams which we in Congress labored long hours to produce since 1965.

This bill provides increased emphasis on and support for five programs, based, in four cases, on the proven success these programs have achieved during their span of operations and, in all cases, on their demonstrated need.

The committee bill, as requested by President Nixon and his OEO Director, would preserve the structure of OEO intact.

The bill would allow OEO to continue its self-imposed labor of putting its house in order and would at the same time enable the Congress to determine the success of the effort.

H.R. 12321 would also—again at the President's request—extend the legislative authority for OEO until the end of fiscal 1972. It would provide \$1,536 billion in unearmarked authorizations for OEO programs. A sum which would be increased by the amounts separately authorized for four very effective programs and one program for which there is a most urgent need.

A new section E is added to the "Manpower" title of the present act. Two programs—Operation Mainstream and New Careers—would thus be given separate and special status among OEO's other manpower programs. Operation Mainstream, a job creation and work training program for chronically unemployed, low-income adults with hope for unsubsidized full-time employment, has been in existence some 2 years. During that time, it has provided nearly 20,000 enrollment opportunities at a cost to the Federal Government of \$72 million. Participants can work in projects for the improvement or beautification of their local communities and in projects involving the management, conservation, or development of natural resources and recreational sites in rural areas or in towns. This program has a tremendous number of enrollees who are 45 or over, an age group that accounts for one-fourth of the total unemployed. The present unemployment situation, plus the enthusiastic endorsement by numerous witnesses before the committee, makes it evident that the continuation—and upgrading—of Operation Mainstream is a national necessity.

Similarly, New Careers has proven its worth in its 2 years of existence. This program provides meaningful job opportunities for low-income persons, particularly by means of opening up new entry routes into the service industries—an area where there is a serious and growing shortage of available workers. The committee found that New Careers, whose enrollees would be able to get off of welfare, has specifically demonstrated the potential for transfer from welfare to human service status, an achievement that is becoming increasingly important in the light of the special emphasis now being given to work alternatives for welfare recipients. H.R. 12321 would provide \$110 million for these two worthwhile work and training programs—of which \$60 million is intended for Operation Mainstream and \$50 million for New Careers.

The 1969 amendments also make special provision for two early childhood

development programs that have been particularly successful: Headstart and Follow Through. A new title IX would be added to the present act which would incorporate these two programs.

The committee—along with most independent observers—found that Headstart was "one of the most effective programs initiated under the authority of the economic opportunity act . . ." and that its importance must be emphasized in the total effort to eliminate poverty. Accordingly, \$458 million would be earmarked for this program in order that more of the preschool children who need this program so desperately could be served by it. Follow Through, the follow-up program for low-income children in their early years of school, would also be given increased emphasis in this bill, and would also receive separately earmarked funds amounting to \$120 million.

The purpose of Headstart is to develop the intellectual, emotional, social, and physical growth of poor preschool children and to focus community attention upon the needs of these children and their families. Acting on the knowledge that the early years of childhood are the most critical in the growth and development cycle, Headstart aims to provide the experience and opportunities for these children to fully develop and succeed in school. Since children of the poor in general have been demonstrably lacking in necessary early experiences available to their more advantaged peers, special help is provided for the disadvantaged child.

In addition to providing services, we must increase our knowledge of how to best intervene in the lives of poor preschool children, substantially integrated with Headstart follow through experimental programs.

Follow Through is a program of great promise in the early primary grades for graduates of Headstart and other quality preschool programs. Follow Through provides these children with special instruction, health and dental care, a nutritious lunch and often breakfast—for many children their only balanced meals—and other services that can make the difference between success and failure in school.

Follow Through is a small program, but it is a research and development program that should tell us a great deal in the next few years about how young children, especially poor children, actually learn and develop as individuals. Such research is vitally needed.

From its inception as a national program in 1967, Follow Through has worked closely and harmoniously with State educational agencies and State officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity. As a national program, this year it has projects in 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Every project was initially recommended for funding by the State concerned.

Finally, H.R. 12321 would add a new title X to the present act in which intensive programs to combat hunger and malnutrition would be authorized. The fact that poverty-related hunger and malnutrition exist in this land of plenty has been recorded and condemned by all observers, including President Nixon.

The committee felt that OEO, with its unique system of local involvement and participation, would be the logical agency to initiate programs to supplement and support our present Federal food assistance programs, which are generally regarded as inadequate. Thus, the 1969 amendments would give OEO broad authority to develop programs to provide food and medical supplies to counteract conditions of starvation and malnutrition among the poor. These programs would supplant the present OEO anti-hunger efforts, the emergency food and medical services program, which has been relatively effective but which has been seriously underfunded. In its place, the new programs authorized by this bill would be provided \$92 million in separately authorized funds.

Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that this bill before us, designed to extend and improve the Economic Opportunity Office programs over the next 2 years, will be substantially accepted and approved here this afternoon.

Back in 1964, this Congress and this Government through the adoption of the original Economic Opportunity Act, declared war upon the poverty of some 30 million American citizens in this affluent land of so much plenty and promise. Our high obligation here today, hopefully in an atmosphere of cooperative understanding and mutual concern, is simply to insure that this war is adequately carried forward, without any crippling amendments.

Many of our colleagues here have very earnest and sincere questions about various features of several different programs being projected by this legislation. Let us give them our most conscientious attention and action, but let us remind ourselves that in every great war, some weaknesses are bound to develop. I submit that a few mistakes and misuses do not constitute justification to entirely suffocate and abandon this crusade for the poor and despairing among us.

I am not suggesting the establishment of perpetual care programs, nor do I think that the great majority of those affected want such care. Our only intention here is that poverty-stricken people and their children, through no fault of their own, who need and will respond to help, will continue to be given such help in improving their own and their family's economic status, so that, gradually, the desperate need of assistance will diminish and the programs, themselves, can, accordingly be correspondingly restricted and eventually eliminated.

The investment proposed under this legislation is unquestionably reasonable and undoubtedly prudent. By all authoritative testimony and evidence, the alternatives, as measured in the costs to this country, direct and indirect, of crime, juvenile delinquency, and productive manpower losses, would vastly outweigh, far into the uncertain future, the expenditures to prevent the everlasting continuation of these national evils.

In the balance, by whatever judgment norm, it is very clear that the war on poverty has been a vitally important and very positive contribution toward the

continuing integrity and stability of our country.

It is a war that was declared by the Federal Government, mainly because the various States were unable to cope with the overall problems involved.

Let us, therefore, Mr. Chairman, continue to give reasonable help and hope and opportunity to those millions of our fellow Americans who are truly trying to help themselves and their children improve the quality of their lives, so that they can more fully contribute to our common and desperate efforts to achieve a more peaceful and progressive country and world.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the parliamentary situation, which has been agreed to, limits time to 6 p.m. for amendments to the Ayres substitute which will prevent an explanation of my amendment.

Accordingly, for the RECORD, let me state my amendment should be entitled, "The Applicability of Canon's Ethics to Legal Services Programs." It is a very simple amendment. It assures the maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. It does nothing more or less than spell out the requirements that the canons of professional ethics promulgated by the American Bar Association will be complied with.

There are widespread allegations that attorneys funded by the poverty program have engaged in solicitation of cases. There are even allegations that some of those under the legal services program are actually practicing law without a license. Certainly, all the attorneys rendering these legal services should be willing to demonstrate proper professional conduct.

My amendment would give an aggrieved citizen the right to register his complaint outside of the bureaucratic channels of the Office of Economic Opportunity. My amendment would have the overall objective of improving these legal services because it would enforce observance of legal ethics. Every attorney would know that complaints could be brought to the attention of the Administrative Office of the U.S. courts, meaning to the attention of someone outside of OEO. There is ample precedent for such a function being performed by the administrative officer of the U.S. courts because at the present time he is required to summarize allegations and complaints under the Safe Streets Act and to convey his summary to the Congress.

Under my amendment the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts would be required to make an annual summary of complaints submitted to him by aggrieved citizens who complain against the legal services projects of OEO. He would simply make a report, objective in character, without evaluation or comment. It would be available upon request to the concerned committees of the Congress. My amendment should receive the support of all those who profess a real interest to improve the legal service section of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now

read by title the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969".

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. AYRES

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. AYRES: Strike out everything following the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969".

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 101. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2,048,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971.

Sec. 102. Sections 161, 245, 321, 408, 615, and 835 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are each amended by striking out "1967" and by inserting in lieu thereof "1968". Section 523 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years" and by inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1969, and the two succeeding fiscal years".

TITLE II—STATE PARTICIPATION IN ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out section 231 (relating to "State Agency Assistance") and by inserting at the end of the title a new part, as follows:

"PART E—PARTICIPATION OF STATES

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 250. It is the purpose of this part to provide an effective mechanism for the positive involvement of State officers, agencies, and administrative resources in the development, carrying out, and coordination of anti-poverty programs within each State, but only if and to the extent a State exercises the options set forth in this part. Accordingly, no State shall be required to establish a State Economic Opportunity Office described in section 251, or to take the further actions outlined in this part, as a condition for the support of programs under this Act in the State. In the event a State shall not choose to participate in the manner provided in this part, or is unable to satisfy the requirements for such participation set forth in this part, the Director shall continue to support eligible programs and projects in such State. However, the Director shall take every appropriate action to encourage effective State participation under this part in accordance with the finding of the Congress that such participation will strengthen the programs authorized by this Act.

"STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 251 (a). The Director shall provide financial assistance to the State Economic Opportunity Office (hereinafter referred to as the 'State Office') designated in accordance with State law, to enable such agency—

"(1) to advise the Governor of the State with respect to the policies and programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity and other resources available to combat poverty within the State, and at the request of the Governor to advise and assist him in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act;

"(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title and to title VIII;

"(3) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title and under title VIII;

"(4) to evaluate programs assisted under this title and under title VIII with a view to improving the capacity of their sponsors to fulfill the purposes of this Act and to utilize with maximum efficiency the financial assistance provided;

"(5) to evaluate State poverty-related programs and State administrative procedures and to develop mechanisms for making them more responsive to the needs of the poor;

"(6) to conduct financial audits of programs within the State supported under this title or under title VIII, at such times and in such a manner as to promote responsible financial management of such programs;

"(7) to mobilize and develop available resources at the State level needed to assist anti-poverty measures within the State;

"(8) to encourage the development of career opportunities for the poor within agencies of State government;

"(9) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies under this Act; and

"(10) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 631 of this Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede effective State involvement in or coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

"(b) The Director shall take steps as will assure that:

"(1) all applications for assistance under this title and under title VIII within a State are submitted through the State Office, and that the Office is afforded a reasonable opportunity to (but not to exceed 30 days) review such applications before transmitting them to the Director (or to his delegate) with such comments and recommendations as the State may deem appropriate;

"(2) each State Office receives advance notice of the proposed approval of any application for assistance or of the proposed funding in the State of any program, project, or other activity under any other title in this Act, and is afforded a reasonable opportunity to comment upon such proposed approval or funding; and

"(3) each State Office receives such other information and technical assistance, and is afforded such other opportunities to play an affirmative role in the programs financed under this Act, as may be required to carry out effectively the functions specified in subsection (a).

"(c) (1) Whenever a State Office (with the concurrence of the Governor) shall recommend against the approval of an application submitted under subsection (b) (1), such application shall not be approved (or shall not be approved without changes suggested by the State Office) for funding under this title unless the Director shall have made a finding that approval of such application would strengthen the overall program plan of a local community action agency; or with respect to applications submitted by other eligible applicants, that the approval of such application would be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

"(2) The Director shall not delegate the responsibility for making the finding required in paragraph (1) except to the heads of other Federal agencies and he shall not make such finding without having first afforded the State Office notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(d) In any grants to or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give prefer-

ence to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the State Offices established under subsection (a), or which have been developed by and will be carried on with the assistance of those Offices.

"(e) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States or State agencies for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this Act.

"STATE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

"Sec. 252. (a) Any State which desires to participate in the development and carrying out of a State developmental and coordinating program for rural and urban community action, as provided by section 253, shall establish a State Economic Opportunity Council (hereinafter referred to as the 'State Council'), appointed by the Governor, which shall be broadly representative of the economic, educational, health, religious, and social services resources of the State and of the public, including persons representative of—

- "(1) urban areas;
- "(2) rural areas;
- "(3) the poor (including representatives both of the urban and rural poor and of racial and ethnic groups in the State which experience a high incidence of poverty);
- "(4) business, industry, and labor;
- "(5) elected municipal officials;
- "(6) elected county officials;
- "(7) federally-assisted programs, such as Model Cities and manpower training, related to the problems of the poor; and
- "(8) fields of professional competence (including both public and private education) in dealing with the problems of poverty.

"(b) The State Council shall advise the State Office on the development of and policy matters arising in the administration of the State developmental and coordinating programs submitted pursuant to section 253, and shall evaluate the programs, services, and activities assisted under this title and make a public report (at least annually) of the results of such evaluations.

"(c) The State Council shall prepare a long-range program plan (or, as may be appropriate from time to time, revisions of or supplements to such plan) for use of funds under sections 221 and 222 and title VIII of this Act which plan (1) is prepared in consultation with the State Office, (2) extends over a period of not less than five years and (3) taking into consideration available resources, sets forth a program of action which, in the judgment of the Council, would assure substantial progress toward achievement of the objectives of the plan.

"(d) From the sums appropriated under the authority of this Act for any fiscal year the Director shall (in accordance with regulations) pay to each State Council an amount equal to the reasonable amounts expended by it in carrying out its functions under this part in such fiscal year, except that the amount available for such purpose shall not exceed \$150,000 and shall not be less than \$50,000.

"STATE DEVELOPMENTAL AND COORDINATION PROGRAMS

"Sec. 253. (a) State desiring to carry out a developmental and coordination program for urban and rural community action shall submit to the Director (at such time and in such detail as he may specify and containing such information as he may deem necessary) an outline for such a program which—

"(1) has been prepared by the State Office in consultation with the State Council of that State and has been approved by the State Council;

"(2) designates the State Office as the sole agency for administration of the State program, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local community action agencies;

"(3) sets forth in detail the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in the distribution of funds to local community action agencies in the State and for the uses of such funds for the various programs and program components specified in sections 221 and 222, which policies and procedures assure that—

"(A) due consideration will be given to the relative needs of urban and rural areas within the State, and to the needs of various categories of persons living in poverty, in accordance with criteria supplied by the Director; and

"(B) due consideration will be given to periodic evaluation of programs, services, and activities assisted under this title;

"(4) describes how the activities and projects to be carried out under the program are related to the long-range program plan developed by the State Council pursuant to section 251(c) (except that such requirement may be waived during the first year the program is in operation);

"(5) sets forth policies and procedures satisfactory to the Director for approval of applications for assistance under sections 221 and 222 of this title and under title VIII submitted by local community action agencies and other qualified applicants, and for the review and monitoring of the program conducted by such applicants (including procedures to assure that such programs conform to the requirements of this Act);

"(6) sets forth procedures designed to improve the coordination of programs funded under this part with State-administered programs affecting the poor;

"(7) provides that any community action agency, or other public or private agency which is a qualified applicant for program assistance under this title, dissatisfied with a final action with respect to any application for funds under this title shall be given reasonable notice and opportunity for a public hearing by the State Office;

"(8) provides assurances that Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement, and to the extent possible increase the amount of State, local, and private funds that would in the absence of federal funds be made available for programs supported under this part, and in no case supplant such State, local, and private funds;

"(9) provides assurances satisfactory to the Director that all relevant requirements of this Act shall be complied with, and provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information and affording such access thereto as the Director may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act; and

"(10) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to qualified applicants) under this title.

"(b) (1) The Director shall by regulation establish criteria for approval of State developmental and coordination programs submitted pursuant to subsection (a), and when he finds that such a program complies with such criteria and the requirements of this part and when he is satisfied that adequate procedures are set forth to insure that the assurances and provisions of such program will be carried out, he shall approve such program, and the Director shall not finally disapprove any program submitted under subsection (a), or any modification thereof, without first affording the State Office reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(2) The Director shall take such steps as he deems necessary to assure that in the formulation and carrying out of State programs there is close liaison between the State Offices and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

"(3) The Director shall take final action to approve or disapprove a State developmental and coordination program submitted under subsection (a) within ninety days after the date of its submission (or resubmission in the event it should have been withdrawn by the State), and he may not delegate the authority to approve or disapprove such programs to any other person.

"(c) (1) For any fiscal year in which any State has in operation a State developmental and coordination program approved in accordance with this part the Director shall make available to such State for carrying out the approved program the sums allotted to such State for such year under section 225 (a) and (b); *Provided, however*, That, until June 30, 1971, the Director may reserve not more than one-fourth such amount, to assist (in accordance with the provisions of this title) activities and projects in such State which are not funded under the State program, but only if the Director has determined that the failure to support such activities and projects during the period in which he may reserve funds would result in a substantial disruption of efforts directed toward the elimination of poverty in such State, or that it is necessary to assist programs authorized under section 222 of this Act.

"(2) The Director shall pay, from the amount available to the State for assistance under this part, to each State the amount required to pay the Federal share of carrying out activities and projects under the approved State program, and for administration of the State program (except that sums paid for State administration shall not exceed five per centum of the amount available to the State for assistance under this title in any fiscal year), and such payments may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"(3) The term "State administration" in paragraph (2) means those costs attributable to the supervision, auditing, coordination, and servicing of activities carried out under this part or to the provision of technical services (including the training of personnel needed to provide such services), and similar costs related to carrying out an approved State program, but shall not include the costs of State operation of a substantive program authorized by this Act.

"(d) (1) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State office administering a State program approved under subsection (a), finds that—

"(A) the State program has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

"(B) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Director shall notify such State office that no further payments will be made to the State under the State program (or, in his discretion, that further payments to the State under the program will be limited to activities under or portions of such program not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Director shall support eligible community action and VISTA volunteer programs in such State in accordance with other provisions of this title (except that he may support those activities under or portions of the State program not affected by such failure).

"(2) A State office which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Director under this

subsection or subsection (b) may appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Director, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Director thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Director or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Director may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Director as to the facts if supported by substantial evidence shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Director, to take further evidence, and the Director may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Director shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Director's action."

TITLE III—TECHNICAL AND PERFECTING AMENDMENTS

PART A—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II ("COMMUNITY ACTION")

COMPOSITION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

SEC. 301. Section 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended as follows:

(1) Clause (3) of subsection (b) is amended to read—

"(3) the remainder of the members (which shall consist of not less than one-quarter of the total membership of such board) are appointed by the elected public officials who serve on or have representatives serving on the board, and are officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups and interests in the community"; and

(2) the first sentence of subsection (c) is amended to read—

"Where a community action agency places responsibility for major policy determinations with respect to the character, funding, extent, and administration of and budgeting for programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area within the community in a subsidiary board, council, or similar agency, such board, council, or agency shall be broadly representative of such area, and it shall be so constituted as to assure that at least one-third of the members are public officials, appointed by the elected public officials who serve (or appoint representatives to serve) on the board of the community action agency, unless the number of such officials reasonably available or willing to serve is less than one-third of the membership of the subsidiary board."

COSTS OF DEFENDING LAW SUITS

SEC. 302. Section 222(a) of such Act is amended by adding to paragraph (3) (relating to "Legal Services") the following:

"Whenever a lawsuit or other legal action is initiated by a plaintiff or plaintiffs with assistance under this program, and such action results in a verdict or other outcome favorable to the defendant in such lawsuit

or other legal action, and the United States shall be liable for such costs (to be paid out of funds made available for the Legal Services program), as are ordered in accordance with the law of the jurisdiction, by the court or other board or agency which has jurisdiction of the matter, the same as a private person."

AUTHORIZATION OF ALCOHOLIC RECOVERY PROGRAM

SEC. 303. Section 222(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) An 'Alcoholic Recovery' program designed to discover and bring about treatment for the disease of alcoholism. Such a program shall be community based, serve the objective of maintaining the family structure as well as recovery of the individual alcoholic, encourage the use of neighborhood facilities and the services of recovered alcoholics as program workers and emphasize the reentry of alcoholics into society rather than the institutionalization of alcoholics. Such a program shall also emphasize the coordination and full utilization of existing appropriate community services which pertain to the treatment of alcoholism and/or related disorders."

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO FAMILIES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES IN HARDSHIP CASES; PILOT PROJECTS OF ASSISTANCE FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

SEC. 304. Section 232 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) The Director shall conduct projects either directly or through grants or other arrangements, under which funds available under this section will be used to raise the income levels of families of members of the Armed Forces, when such families reside in the United States and through exceptional circumstances have an income level below the poverty level (as determined by the Director), and preference shall be given to cases of greatest hardship. Projects under this subsection shall be developed jointly by the Director and the Secretary of Defense.

"(h) The Director shall also conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, pilot projects under which funds available under this section will be used to raise the income levels of persons over 65 years of age above the poverty level (as determined by the Director), with preference given to cases of exceptional hardship, in order to examine and evaluate systems of income maintenance for the elderly poor as an alternative to welfare assistance."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT OF GOVERNOR'S VETO PROVISION

SEC. 305. Section 242 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting:

"; *Provided, however,* That this section shall not apply with respect to any application which the State Office has recommended not be approved under section 251(c) (1)."

AUTHORIZATION OF STATE AUDIT

SEC. 306. Section 243 of such Act is amended by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(e) The Director shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that programs assisted under this title shall be subject to financial audit by appropriate State officials and agencies at the request of such officials and agencies, and he shall direct the governing board of each community action agency to cooperate in carrying out such audits."

PART B—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI (ADMINISTRATION)

PROHIBITION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITY STRENGTHENED

SEC. 321. Section 603(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For purposes of chapter 15 of title 5

of the United States Code any overall community action agency which assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating community-wide antipoverty programs, or any agency assuming part or all of such responsibilities (including the administration of components of a community action program) under delegation from an overall community action agency, and receives assistance under this Act, shall be deemed to be a State or local agency."

ANTI-RIOT PROVISION STRENGTHENED

SEC. 322. Section 613 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 613. No individual employed or assigned by any community action agency or any other agency assisted under this Act shall (whether or not pursuant to or during the performance of services rendered in connection with any program or activity conducted or assisted under this Act) plan, initiate, participate in, or otherwise aid or assist in the conduct of any unlawful demonstration, rioting, or civil disturbance, and the Director shall take such steps as may be necessary to assure that any individual who violates this provision is removed from his employment or assignment in programs conducted or assisted under this Act."

PROHIBITIONS ON UPWARD BOUND PROGRAMS

SEC. 323. Section 621 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 621." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Director shall give full effect to the intent of Congress that 'Upward Bound' programs, however, described, shall be administered by the Commissioner of Education, and the Director shall not carry out or fund any program described in section 222(a) (5) (as in effect on June 30, 1969), or any comparable program, whether under the authority of that section or any other section of this Act, and whether or not carried on by or in a school, institution of higher education, penal or correctional institution, or any other agency or institution."

SEC. 324. Title VI of such Act is further amended by adding at the end of Part A the following new subsections:

"EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

"SEC. 622. (a) The Director shall: (1) at the time of entering into any contract or arrangement with non-governmental organizations or individuals for the evaluation of programs or projects administered by him under this Act, or entering into any substantial modification of any existing such contract or arrangement, furnish to the Comptroller General of the United States a copy of the contract or modification thereof or a description of the arrangement or modification thereof, together with a statement of the bases upon which he considers the evaluation work involved and the estimated cost thereof justified, and upon which he has determined that it was necessary to contract or arrange with a non-governmental organization or individual for its performance;

(2) require each community action agency designated under section 201 of this Act, to advise him of each contract or arrangement entered into by it with non-governmental organizations or individuals for the evaluation of programs or projects administered by it under this Act, including information regarding the purpose, cost, scope, evaluation methodology, and organizations or individuals involved in such contract or arrangement; and

(3) furnish to the Comptroller General of the United States at the end of each calendar quarter a listing of all contracts or arrangements reported to him in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection during such calendar quarter, including identification of the program or project, the organization or individual and the cost involved in each contract or arrangement.

"(b) The Comptroller General shall conduct evaluations of programs carried out under this Act, and upon request by a committee of the Congress, or to the extent personnel are available, by Members of Congress shall (1) conduct studies of existing statutes and regulations governing programs carried on under this Act, (2) review the policies and practices of Federal agencies administering such programs, (3) review the evaluation procedures adopted by such agencies carrying out such programs, (4) initiate evaluation projects of particular programs, and (5) compile data necessary to carry out the preceding functions.

"(c) In carrying out the studies and evaluations herein authorized, the Comptroller General shall give particular attention to the practice of the Office of Economic Opportunity and of community action agencies designated under section 201 of the Act of contracting with private firms, organizations and individuals for the provision of a wide range of studies and services (such as personnel recruitment and training, program evaluation, and program administration), and shall report to the Director and to the Congress his findings with respect to the necessity for such contracts and their effectiveness, in achieving the objectives of this Act.

"(d) The Comptroller General or any of his duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to the financial assistance received by any agency under this Act."

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of these sections.

"PREVENTION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST"

"SEC. 623. The Director shall issue regulations and take such other steps as may be necessary to assure that the Office of Economic Opportunity (or any other agency utilizing funds appropriated under the authority of this Act) shall not contract with, make a grant to, or enter into any other type of financial arrangement with, any individual who has been an officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity or any other agency of the executive branch of the United States Government which administers funds appropriated under the authority of this Act (or with a partner of such individual, or with a firm or business organization in which such individual holds a substantial financial interest or in which he serves as an officer), within one year after such employment, for any service or activity (other than reemployment as an officer or employee of a department or agency of the United States Government) in which such person participated personally and substantially as an officer or employee through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise.

"PAYMENT OF DUES PROHIBITED"

"SEC. 624. No funds appropriated under the authority of this Act shall be used for or on behalf of any person, organization, or agency to make any payment in the nature of dues or membership fees in any public or private organization or association.

"NEPOTISM PROHIBITED"

"SEC. 625. No person shall be employed (or continue in employment) with funds appropriated under the authority of this Act in a position (1) over which a member of his immediate family exercises supervisory authority, or (2) while he or a member of his immediate family serves on a board or committee which has authority to order personnel actions affecting such position, or (3) while he or a member of his immediate family serves on a board or committee

which, either by rule or practice, regularly nominates, recommends, or screens candidates for the agency or program in which such position is located. For the purposes of this section, a member of an immediate family shall include any of the following persons: husband, wife, father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter, uncle, aunt, niece, nephew, father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, son-in-law, or daughter-in-law."

PART C—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VIII ("VISTA")

RESTRUCTURING ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 331. Section 810 (a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out that part of the first sentence which precedes the numbered paragraphs and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The Director is authorized to make grants to State and local public agencies to recruit, select, train and assign persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs. Such programs shall be those established by the grantee agency or (upon satisfactory assurance that the work of such volunteers will be supervised by competent individuals) by other public agencies or private nonprofit organizations, which involve the assignment of volunteers to work—"

ASSISTANCE IN LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

SEC. 332. Section 834 of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection, as follows:

"(f) Persons serving as volunteers under this title shall provide legal services or legal counsel only as a part of a legal services program (and at the request and under the supervision of the directors of such program) supported under section 222(a)(3) of this Act."

Mr. AYRES (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, the amendment is printed in the RECORD as of yesterday, it is in today's RECORD, and in view of that and the 3 hours of discussion on the substitute, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his substitute amendment.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the substitute amendment has been thoroughly discussed in general debate. I think it is understood by all why many of us, on both the minority side and majority side, feel that a substitute proposal is necessary. I repeat that this is not an Ayres substitute as such, it is not a Republican substitute as such, but it is an amendment that was worked out by the members of the Republican Party and members of the Democratic Party in a truly bipartisan manner.

However, it is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that there are several amendments to be offered to the substitute, and I would hope that we can give serious consideration to the amendments, because after the President's press conference of Monday evening, we were advised, both publicly, through the press and over the television, that the President has suggested in very exacting terms that we work toward accommodations. That we have done.

I want to commend the gentlemen who

have worked so hard to bring about a meeting of the minds in this very complicated and controversial field. This substitute is not a slap in any way at the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Quite the contrary, it is a sincere attempt to give him the tools that we feel are necessary, having lived with this program for over 5 years, for him to do the job to help the poor, which we all know has not been done under the existing structure of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I would hope today, Mr. Chairman, we can pass the substitute. We can go to conference with the other body with a vehicle which will make it possible for us to come back to this House with a proposal which is acceptable to the House and at the same time will give this program redirection, under new leadership, so that when we come back after this act expires, approximately a year and a half from now, we will be able to say to ourselves, "We did a good job. The Director has done a good job. The original purpose of this act, to help the poor people of this country, has been accomplished."

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I only have 5 minutes, so I do not have enough time to go through all of them. Let me try to recite two or three.

In the first place, this proposal to turn the control of the efforts to fight poverty in our country over to the States is an antilocal control amendment if I ever saw one. We get a lot of speeches in this place about how deeply we care about assuring local control over important Federal programs, but I have here in front of me a letter which I take it all of us received today, signed by four outstanding mayors of our country. I really do not know the political views or the partisan affiliation of most of these mayors, except the one from my own State, the mayor of the city of Indianapolis, Mayor Richard G. Lugar, who has just been elected to an important position as the leader, I guess it is, of the National League of Cities.

All four of these mayors—of Philadelphia, Pa.; San Leandro, Calif.; San Diego, Calif.; and Indianapolis, Ind.—are mayors who are strongly opposed to the legislation proposed here today in the nature of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. They say:

As the local elected officials closest to the individuals that these programs serve, we urge you to reject any attempt to remove the control of these programs from the local communities. The substitute would remove the control but leave the responsibility for the programs on the shoulders of the mayors of this land.

Mr. Chairman, the mayors sent along an editorial from the current issue of the magazine of the National League of Cities, Nation's Cities, which states:

To sweep away the truly local character antipoverty programs would be most unfortunate. And to sweep them away under the guise of local control when the true meaning is state control would be a fraud on the public and particularly on the poor.

The mayors say, "A fraud on the public and particularly on the poor." That is not I speaking as a Democratic member of the committee. This is from a letter signed by four outstanding mayors of both parties, making very clear what the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and those who support it represents.

I have here a letter I have received from my Republican friend from Indianapolis, Mayor Lugar, who says in his letter dated November 17:

I am hopeful that you will vote to defeat amendments offered to provide state governmental interference in the O.E.O. programs. I can assure you that I need to maintain control by the City of Indianapolis of any O.E.O. programs in our jurisdiction in order that the results will be reasonable and just. Relationships between Indianapolis and O.E.O., directly, are often complex. Interposing state government in the middle of these relationships would create an intolerable mess, in my judgment.

That is a second reason why this amendment seems to me to be most unfortunate, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that those who have observed State government in the United States are aware that historically our State governments have done almost nothing to make any serious contribution toward solving the great problem of enormous poverty in a very wealthy land.

I come from the State of Indiana, and I know whereof I speak when I refer to my own State. My own State does not even have a State economic opportunity office. My own State does not even allow, because of the position of our Governor, the people of the State of Indiana to participate in the programs afforded by the Older Americans Act.

My own State, only this year, within the last month, decided to join the union and permit the citizens of Indiana to have an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of the continuing education program under the Higher Education Act.

The fact of the matter is, and everybody here knows it, that State governments have been notoriously recalcitrant about responding to the needs of urban people generally, but of poor people in particular in both rural and urban America.

And for Congress to vote to take the Federal funds that President Nixon, when he urged that we extend for a period of 2 years the present poverty program, and turn these funds over to the States, would be an indication that Congress is not willing to give consideration to any serious and honorable means to help the poor people of our country.

Mr. Chairman, it is possible that the wealthiest nation that mankind has ever known will turn away from the ancient and serious problem of poverty?

As the mayors wrote, the substitute amendment and its results would be a fraud on the public and particularly on the poor. They know it. They just have a hard time getting their message through to their elected Representatives in Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I hope very much the substitute is defeated.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the bill reported by our committee. I offer my support—not because the bill meets the needs of poor Americans—but because it is the only bill we have which incorporates the kinds of concerns translated into programs which can address the needs of poor Americans. I strongly oppose the substitute bill proposed by certain Members of this body who seek to turn OEO over to the States. And I submit that their effort would effectively destroy these programs for the poor—and would give a dose of overkill to the little hope left for rallying this Government to a solution for poverty.

Any Member who can seriously suggest that the States of Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, and others—both North and South—will pick up the banner of social and economic reform and charge into the poverty areas in those States—is simply ignoring truth and fact. Any Member who seriously contemplates turning responsibility for alleviating poverty—to the machineries and mechanism which have rigidly served to perpetrate the conditions of poverty—is not committed to equal opportunity but to the status quo.

It was only recently that President Nixon unveiled to the American people the welfare mess which has resulted from the individual State administration of those social programs. We are aware of the gross discrepancies which exist among the States—in their unwillingness and inability to meet the needs of poor people. We know that the migration of the poor from many States into the urban ghettos comes about because they are trying to get away from the harsh climates of hatred and closed systems which exist in many States.

It has been said that we cannot change the way a person feels by legislation—but to some extent, we can alter his behavior. No one knows better at this time than the poor—the Federal administration of Federal programs is the only way they have received any benefits from social and economic reform efforts. We know the present dispositions of too many State administrations and they are not inclined toward the eradication of poverty. In fact, many of them still maintain that poor people are responsible for their poverty. Anyone who holds such notions should not be given the reins of control over OEO programs. And yet this is what the Green-Quie substitute intends—that without regard for the documented and established records that many States have for "keeping poor people down"—we should give them the responsibility for "raising poor people up." State governments have not taken it upon themselves as their public duty to educate, to train, to feed, to employ, to meet the health needs, the legal services needs of the poor. We need innovative approaches to these problems—which we have seen through OEO federally administered. You cannot assign contemporary solution making to people who think only along traditional lines.

When you talk about transferring OEO programs to State administration, giving

them the responsibility for approving all OEO program applications before they are sent to OEO for funding, giving State economic opportunity councils the sole authority to develop an antipoverty program for the State—you are in essence talking about writing off the poor, and turning the administration of a federally funded program aimed at the poor to State administrations which have shown little sensitivity for the poor.

If some Members have the notion that this substitute gives the responsibility for problem solving to the people closest to the problems, they are wrong. Look at the welfare food budgets in the States of Alabama and Mississippi. In Alabama, a poor person is allowed 6 cents a meal on which to eat—or \$1.40 for an entire week. And in Mississippi, a poor person must get by on only 4 cents a meal—and only 80 cents a week. In my own State of Missouri, the allowance is only 11 cents for a meal or a total of \$2.50 a week. These are a few examples of how close the State governments are to the problems of poverty—how sympathetically they review the needs. In Missouri there is one black highway patrolman. In the highway department—8,000 employees—less than 20 blacks. I know how our Governor will administer.

No, gentlemen, the substitute offered by Members of this body, GREEN and QUIE, cannot be made out to be anything but what it is—legislation to cripple the whole poverty effort. I, for one, know very well how the States would welcome this authority.

There is no way I can vote for tying any part of OEO to the States—whether it is legal services, VISTA, community action, and surely not when you are destroying the whole concept behind OEO and farming it all out. How can you expect those of us familiar with the problems of poverty to stand still while you work to get members of community action and neighborhood board appointed by elected officials? When we are talking about the participation of communities and individuals in their own programs, here comes a substitute legislative sham which would guarantee there would be no such representation.

Members of this body who share my concern and know the facts of State administration for poverty programs—could talk for hours giving illustrations which support this case.

Whether or not, and irrespective of how the positions supporting the substitute may be rationalized, such a vote will register the mark of a confused mind. Whatever any Member says about his vote for the substitute—or any legislation tied to State consideration and control—do not say it is in the interest of the poor.

To those who are supporting the substitute and who are using as a shield the fact that you have a glorious past of supporting the poor—I say that the commitment to justice and equality is a continuing one—if you were for the poor yesterday and against them today—then you were either hypocritical yesterday or you are hypocritical today.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I am disturbed about the reference which the gentleman has made to the possibility of such a program of State planning failing in Georgia and in other States.

Mr. CLAY. Mississippi and Alabama.

Mr. LANDRUM. Let me say to the gentleman in response to that suggestion this: Today I was in a telephone conversation with a director of the Atlanta, Ga., Office of Economic Opportunity and was told by him—not in answer to a question, but voluntarily—that at no time in history has that office ever made a recommendation to Governor Maddox but that it was accepted by the Governor. The Governor has said that while he differed with reference to certain aspects of the program, and that he recognized there was a problem but as long as he was Governor he was going to do what he could to help those the original act was intended to help.

Mr. CLAY. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia the question we are discussing today is the effort of the poor people in the State of Georgia to improve their condition. In the State of Georgia the record is quite clear that Georgia in its attitude has not carried forth the program as it was designed to be. For instance, in Alabama a poor person on State welfare is allowed 6 cents a meal on which to eat or \$1.40 for an entire week. In Mississippi, a poor person on State welfare must get by on only 4 cents a meal and only 80 cents a week. In my own State of Missouri, the allowance is only 11 cents for a meal or a total of \$2.50 a week.

In Mississippi today there is a program, the Headstart program, that is being held up by the Governor because he will not ratify the grant unless the people of Headstart agree to certain conditions that the Governor would like. Some of those conditions are as I understand them to be that the people of Headstart take on the responsibility of stopping boycotts by black people of white merchants in four counties of Mississippi. In three of those counties there are no Headstart programs. The Governor insists that before he approves the sum of \$7 million for a Headstart program that they give him the exclusive right of firing anyone whom he charges is engaged in any kind of political activity. I say that the Southern States in this country represent one instance where there has been resistance to a program of this kind directed toward alleviating the conditions of poverty on the part of people who have been insensitive to this problem in this regard.

AMENDMENT TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ESCH

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH to the substitute amendment: At the end of title II of the substitute bill insert a new section as follows:

"EXEMPTION OF HEADSTART PROGRAMS

"SEC. 254. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (during any period in

which he has been delegated responsibility for the administration of those programs authorized under section 222(a)(1) and 222(a)(2) of this Act) may exempt such programs from inclusion under the provisions of this part (either generally or with respect to inclusion in the program approved for a particular State)."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have explained the provisions of this amendment during the general debate, but I would like to review them for the Committee at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to exempt the Headstart and Follow Through programs which are already being delegated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, from this substitute.

I think it is essential that we recognize that the President has begun to develop an orderly transfer and a gradual transfer of these programs into the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare, so that this transfer is being pursued not in a disruptive manner, but in an orderly process.

The amendment will continue this process.

I think that we should also recognize that Secretary Finch has indicated his desire that we adopt this amendment, which is a perfecting amendment, and one which I hope will have the support of the entire Committee. He has stated that the transfer of Headstart in an orderly way to the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare, would be seriously impaired, if the substitute is adopted without excluding Headstart.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be accepted by the Committee so that the transfer can continue to occur.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the thrust of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, but what I do not understand is this:

If the gentleman is not willing to trust little children to the tender mercies of the State governments, why is he willing to go along apparently with trusting adults?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the question asked by the gentleman from Indiana. I think that the gentleman is well aware that the transfer is already in existence, and it is not a question of whether you trust or do not trust the States, or trust the Federal Government; the point is that there is in process an orderly transfer to HEW of these early child programs.

Surely the gentleman from Indiana would concur that any future legislation will have this direction rather than in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member on the committee.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I just noticed that the gentlewoman from Oregon was on her feet, and since the gentle-

woman has been so active in this I wonder if she might comment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the contention of the gentleman from Michigan that the Headstart and Follow Through programs are already over in the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am one of those who urged such a transfer by legislative action last year.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) makes this transfer much easier, and also more certain.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would support the perfecting amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and I hope that it will be adopted by the House.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would also say to the gentleman from Michigan that this is discretionary with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and already they have gone through four seed programs to work out the situation, and in 19 States it has already been worked out.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. As the gentleman is aware, I conferred with the gentleman at some length prior to his offering the amendment, and after the gentleman spoke in general debate I had a chance to review it carefully, and we on the minority side accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Ohio, and I hope that the Committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes. I only want to draw attention to the ludicrous nature of the situation in which we find ourselves in respect to the kind of amendment offered by our friend from the State of Michigan.

For his amendment, I think, really has nothing to do with whether or not Headstart has been transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—a fact with which we are familiar.

The point is that the gentleman's amendment would in effect remove from the control of local communities and turn over to the States the Headstart programs which have proved to be so enormously popular and effective throughout the Nation for children of preschool age. Indeed, in my own subcommittee, as the gentleman knows, we are now considering legislation, H.R. 13520, the Comprehensive Preschool Education and Child Day Care Act, that will extend the benefits of Headstart-type programs to all children, regardless of income group.

But the harsh fact of the matter is,

and we ought to be very candid about it, that the effort is here being made by the proponents of differing antipoverty programs to exempt from the control of the States the particular programs in which they sympathize. This effort to exempt such programs is nothing but a confession of the unwisdom of giving control of these programs to the States and stripping the control away from the local communities that have heretofore operated them.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ESCH. I think the intent of this amendment to clarify an action that is already onboard—and that is a delegation of responsibility for Headstart and Follow Through programs from the OEO to HEW. That is an orderly process that is now onboard. It is a recognition of a fact that already exists and hopefully they will continue to work both with State and local educational groups and local agencies.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman completely misses the point of what I am trying to say, and I am confident that he is aware that he is missing the point of what I am trying to say.

We are not talking about the impact of the transferability of the Headstart program from OEO to HEW. That is not the issue at all.

The point is rather this: Are Headstart programs going to be exempted from the tender mercies of those State governments which we are all aware have not been shown to be very generous about preschool programs for the poor and have shown not very much initiative at all about showing the slightest degree of concern about poor people until the Federal legislation authorizing an effort to fight poverty in the country came along?

I am sure the gentleman knows what we are talking about. I am not talking about the question of transferability to HEW.

If he wants to throw posies at Headstart, I certainly understand the thrust of his amendment. But I just wish he would be more candid in his explanation.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is well that we pause just briefly at least and review what it was we were driving at when this legislation originally came to the House in 1964.

When economic opportunity legislation was introduced into the House in 1964, it was in the hope that the package of proposals being offered would provide services that would help millions of Americans become participants in our economy and our society—to become taxpayers rather than taxeaters.

It had been 25 years since Pearl Harbor ended the first war on poverty. International problems and apparent prosperity had dominated the attention of the majority of Americans during the 1940's and 1950's—but now there was an uneasiness that there were too many men, women, and children who were not sharing in America's growth.

Essentially an underdeveloped province, what little progress they made was vastly outstripped by the rapidly growing technology of the "haves."

Right here in America was a microcosm of the world problem of the haves and the have-nots—the developed and the underdeveloped. There were many of us who felt that the future for a nation so divided would be as uncertain as that Lincoln described as half slave and half free.

The problems of this Nation's poor, moreover, were so diverse and complicated, that it seemed that only a massive and multisided attack composed of many daring new programs—in addition to expanded older programs—could provide the impetus necessary to make progress. For coordination and maximum thrust, it seemed best to have those efforts focused by one agency—an agency able to reach directly into communities.

Neither congressional supporters nor administration backers expected instant success. We knew the job ahead would be very difficult. But apparently the public expected immediate progress and the poor allowed themselves to become hopeful long before administrative gears meshed.

The result was a rush for results before adequate planning. Procedures for evaluation were often nonexistent. Dr. Fred Crawford, director of the Center for Research in Social Change at Emory University, who studied the Atlanta OEO program for a 3-year period has reported that, and I quote:

Services were started, people were involved, but no one was gathering evidence to use in determining what was happening. This is comparable, he says, to shooting a rocket at the moon with no means of tracking the rocket after launching, no means of correcting its course in flight, and no way to tell whether it landed or not.

As Dr. Crawford points out, such a procedure is not only expensive, but dangerous from a psychological and sociological point of view. He explains that:

The ramifications of intrusive forces on human lives, as positive as these may be in intent, apparently create more problems than they resolve. . . . Prior testing and accurate projections of immediate and long-range effects seem totally necessary if we are not to damage individuals and the social system through the introduction of "good" program.

In addition to a dangerous lack of planning and anticipation of results, many local OEO programs have had difficulty in delivering the services they are supposed to deliver. There are strong indications that this has not just been the result of inadequate funding—but a result of the structure of the OEO program and its relationships with other local agencies.

A good example of a problem area is that of finding jobs for the poor. The study of the local OEO program in Atlanta indicates that 72 percent of the black clients and almost 57 percent of the white clients visiting neighborhood centers for the first time come seeking help in locating jobs—statistics which should certainly counter the arguments that most of the poor do not want to work.

So they come seeking employment. Unfortunately, however, not many find it. The usual procedure is to refer them to other employment agencies—and the usual result is not very good. Only one in three are placed. Furthermore, as many as three-fourths of these placements are for jobs classified as "menial"—jobs which will not take the recipients out of poverty.

For the young there are a few job training openings—but not nearly enough—and often not in the subjects applicants desired. For the middle aged and older, training and retraining are virtually nonexistent.

I have come to believe that one of the reasons local OEO agencies have not been able to deliver services is that they cannot or will not work closely enough with other local institutions. Supposed to be catalysts to community development, they are often viewed as foreign objects.

The structure of the Office of Economic Opportunity is admittedly an administrative experiment. Grants from Washington are made through regional offices to locally incorporated groups which are constituted according to national OEO guidelines.

In most instances, however, local OEO groups seem to be responsible to no one but themselves: not to Washington, not to regional offices, not to the communities in which they serve—or to the poor, and Washington headquarters of OEO assumes the attitude toward Congress. They look at us with contempt.

The result is that benefits have often been obscured by controversy. There has not been enough planning and coordination of activities with State and local officials. And there have been too many instances of poor administration and of self-dealing. By "self-dealing" I mean instances of profitmaking on contracted services and evaluations undertaken by former OEO employees.

One can only conclude that it is time to achieve more responsible and responsive administration. To establish planning systems that will assure coordination with other agencies. To establish evaluation systems that will give us a clear idea of what good and what harm we are doing the poor. We must harness OEO and other poverty-fighting forces for a protracted war. We cannot continue to dissipate our few resources in false starts, waste, and in-fighting. State planning seems to me to be the best solution to our aim and desire to reach the poor and to our desire to have the OEO in general respect the intent of the Congress.

Now I am not in disagreement at all with my distinguished young friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) when he talks about what we need to accomplish.

Our difference is in the way to approach it, and the way I am afraid he has his thinking oriented toward a welfare program here. This is not a welfare program—this is an education program. This is a program that is designed to take Americans out of welfare and make them become taxpayers rather than taxeaters. That is the purpose of this program. It is not being managed toward this goal.

Now, I yield to no Member of this body or no man in this land in my concern for the poor. Long before some of those here today were advocating continuation of the program as it is I was standing where the distinguished chairman is, fighting for the original program, and we have had some successes. The Headstart program is an example. But we have had some failures, and we ought to stand and recognize the fact that these failures are making the country criticize this program and are preventing it from having the success that it must have.

Therefore, I can come to only one conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(On request of Mr. WAGGONNER, by unanimous consent, Mr. LANDRUM was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I would merely like to say, for those who have not been around here since the inception of the program, it is easy to recall that the gentleman in the well, Mr. LANDRUM of Georgia, stood, as he just recalled to us, in the well of the House initially handling this legislation, and he had exactly the same thing to say then that he has to say now about the hopes and the aspirations of this program. He described it then as a program to make taxpayers out of taxeaters. He made crystal clear that we were not talking about a welfare program. It was to be an educational process to improve the ability of our citizens to do something for themselves. He made a very good explanation of the bill then and its noble purposes, and I simply want to say he is only reiterating now what he had to say then.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Let me say these final words. I have not used any time during the general debate. I am not now a member of this committee. I sometimes miss its activities.

But let me say that no one here is more concerned about the continuation of this program and having it do what it was originally intended to do than the Member speaking to you now. I believe, after a thorough examination and observation of all the activities of OEO, that unless we change direction in its administration, unless we make the change that is indicated in this substitute, we are dooming the program to failure. I do not believe it is dangerous to resort to the State capitals, the Governors, the mayors, and the leadership at home for, after all, from whence did we come? How are you going to question the sincerity of a Governor, of a mayor, of a State legislator, of a State superintendent of schools in formulating programs to meet these objectives when after all he comes from the same source from which we come and has the same aspirations and hopes that we have?

I want this program to continue. I want it to succeed. I want to see every man, woman, and child in this Nation

participate. I want to see them made taxpayers instead of taxeaters. But I am telling you, as one who bled for the original passage of this act, that unless we change its direction today, the act is going to fail in its mission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM).

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

You know, it is a beautiful thing to sit here this afternoon and to listen to so much debate and bleeding hearts concerned about this program. And yet many of us feel and realize that we would not have had to be on this floor today discussing this program if there was such a thing as equality in every State of this Nation.

The fact of the matter is this: Let us stop practicing a fraud. Let me tell you now about this substitute amendment.

The fact of the matter is that it is nothing more than political patronage that will be returned to the States. If the Members are so concerned about the utilization of the funds for the poor, and that these funds have not been administered correctly, I believe that we should have addressed ourselves to correcting the abuses or the negatives in the program.

For the first time we gave the disillusioned poor, black and white, in this country the feeling that some group or some agency was concerned.

How can Members explain to me that they are so concerned about the funds not going to the poor? The cost of this new layer of administration is being ignored. The substitute amendment allocates \$50 million for State administration, all to be paid from title II funds allocated to each State. This means \$50 million less than that which would have been available to serve the needs of the poor, about whom we are so concerned in the local areas.

Why, then, since we have utilized approximately 2.19 percent for administration of the title II program, the CAP program, over the past 4 years, must we now double that allowance under the substitute bill for the State administration? Who is kidding whom?

The present administrative cost would be about 5 percent of the funds of this new large layer of bureaucracy, this new large layer of pork barrel patronage.

How can we be so concerned about the money going to the poor? Once again we see the poor as the scapegoat.

How can we be so concerned about using money which is going to the poor, when under this new bill approximately 5 percent, as contrasted to 2.19 percent, would go for administrative cost of the title II program?

I have just spoken briefly about the title II program. I have been delving into this thing now for the past 8 weeks. It is so wonderful for us always to be using the children, the poor and every other kind of revolutionary group, and whatever you have for scapegoats.

If we are really concerned about the poor of this Nation, we should accept the positive aspects of the program and then take the negative aspects and seek to improve those parts of the program.

In this U.S. Congress we do not abolish the Congress or do away with it, in spite of the fact that we have deficiencies and scandals. We do not do that. What we attempt to do is to see if in some way, although it is very slow to succeed, we can bring about an amelioration of certain conditions.

It seems to me that we must not defraud. We must recognize that there are errors and that there are abuses in the OEO program. I am not going to stand here before you this afternoon and tell you that the program is perfect. But neither am I going to say that the return of these programs to the States is the answer, because precisely why the program was developed in this Nation was the fact that large numbers of the States in this Nation for a long time were not addressing themselves to the concern of the poor.

I know that some Members do not like what I am saying, but the fact is that we have to face reality.

I would be very glad to yield to someone on the committee, because perhaps I got wrong information, but I wish someone on the committee would explain to me, if we are so concerned about the fact that the money has not been going to the poor, why we now want the money to really get to the poor and at the same time, under the new program, approximately 5 percent of the money under title II will be going for administrative cost as compared to a 2.19 percent for the past 4 years under OEO?

In recent weeks I have heard a number of charges or contentions about the Office of Economic Opportunity that I consider either unsupported by available facts or that are essentially biased in nature.

Some of our esteemed colleagues introduced a substitute bill recently, the basis of which seemed to contain a number of misconceptions. At that time there were some statements made that I thought that I might do well to check. I have done so and would now like to make some counter statements.

One of the statements had to do with the growth of businesses, especially consultant firms, centering around the OEO in particular and the antipoverty effort in general. Accordingly, I asked my staff to try to determine how many firms were involved in consultant relationships and further how many of those firms were headed by ex-employees of the OEO.

I also asked them to take it one step further and secure the same information for the other major Federal agencies, the Departments of Labor, Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Transportation, and the Department of Defense.

The first response was received from the Legislative Research Section of the Library of Congress and it was basically, first, that such information was not centralized, even in the agencies themselves; second, that given enough time, subpoena power, and manhours, a questionnaire might be possible for development of an approximate list, but the cost for such firms could not be ascertained without consulting the agencies concerned.

Now to the best of my knowledge no committee in either body of this Con-

gress has ever attempted such an endeavor nor has any individual. Therefore, I must assume that the statement was a generalization not based on known facts.

And as a generalization, I or anyone else, would be hard put to contest the statement. In fact I would be inclined to concur and applaud if the statement is in fact true. It would then be at very least a minor indication that the priorities of some people in the country have indeed changed.

The Department of Defense and I dare say other Government agencies of similar nature have not only subsidized but have indeed created consultant firms and "think tanks" of the nature some are wont to castigate OEO for and they have done so with almost no criticism from certain quarters.

Correlated to that statement about the new antipoverty consultant corporations was the suggestion that the Department of Justice investigate all such corporations. That is a suggestion that I concur with—provided that the scope of such an investigation be broadened to include the agencies that I have previously mentioned as well as a separate investigation into the number of retired military personnel hired by corporations with Defense Department contracts.

Another statement that has been made is almost too general to respond to and that is precisely why one must undertake a response. The charge is that antipoverty funds have been used to support revolutionary groups. None of the groups were named specifically, perhaps because there have been no such instances in reality, but nevertheless since I know that our different biases make us see the object in different ways let me essay to respond to that one also.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, itself, was created with an eye toward change. It undoubtedly hired some people who worked for change in what some of us might consider the wrong ways; just as business sometimes hires as workers people who will not work or the electorate elects legislators who do not legislate. There is no conspiracy to do so in the two latter cases nor has there been in the first. In fact, in my opinion, OEO may have a better track record than business or the electorate.

My final comment on this point is simply this: If anyone has sufficient facts to prove the contention that there was—or is—an active concerted effort on the part of OEO to hire enemies of this country, please present them to me so that I may change my opinion.

Having finally reached the matter of the substitute bill itself permit me to preface the balance of my remarks.

I, also, do not feel that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been as generally effective as it might have been. But much of its problem has been the year to year—at the whim of Congress—manner in which it has existed.

The bally-hoo with which it was started might have led some to believe that poverty would be ended in a year but I doubt it. It has had to expend entirely too much staff time and energy

on congressional relations and public relations.

Nevertheless, because of its experimental and innovative nature, it has created and will hopefully continue to create programs of a positive nature that will indeed go far toward solving the problems of the poor—and as a consequence many of the internal problems of the Nation.

Among those programs, the most important three to my way of thinking, have been the community action program, the legal services program, and the VISTA program. Unfortunately for OEO they are also the three that have been most controversial in nature and the three that seem least popular with Congressmen.

These are the three, it would seem, that have given impetus to the introduction of the substitute bill.

Let me examine if I may two of the statements made about this substitute bill. The first was that State and local governments have got to run the poverty program. Many of you gentlemen were no doubt sitting in the same seats when that same thing was said in 1967.

At that time an amendment was attached to the Economic Opportunity Act. It was popularly known as the Green amendment and provided State and local governments with the option of taking over the local community action programs.

There was a further condition to the act that year. It directed OEO to contract for an independent study of the results of the Green amendment. The results were quite clear—only 3.3 percent of the local entities chose to do so, and to my knowledge no States chose to designate themselves as the CAA within the State.

One contention was that OEO had so administered the amendment that it stifled and discouraged State governments from designating themselves. My feeling is that if it is true, then the OEO administrators were smarter than the State administrators and ought indeed be running our antipoverty program if we are to have a successful effort.

The final point that I would like to discuss is a point of inconsistency. The issue raised was that of Republican and Democratic Party officials, at the local level, being involved in the antipoverty effort.

First, it is inconsistent to require up to one-third representation on local antipoverty boards for public officials and then to criticize their involvement in the program.

Second, it is inconsistent to suggest that the State and local governments run the program in entirety, as the substitute bill suggests, and then say there is already overinvolvement by political figures.

Third, it is inconsistent with the previous Green amendment which was designed to provide the opportunity for overinvolvement.

Fourth and finally, it is inconsistent with the findings of the study pursuant with the Green amendment. One of which was that some representatives of the poor felt their influence actually increased when Government officials joined

the board. There are many other elements that support my contention that OEO must be kept as an intact entity. Many of my colleagues have already or will in the coming days discuss them. For me I can only say that I felt it necessary to respond to these rather specious arguments I have heard that supposedly support dismantling the agency.

In summary may I say that all rational reasons point toward not only maintaining the Office of Economic Opportunity as the Federal antipoverty agency but expending its mandate to end poverty in this country.

The only thing that the present substitute bill would do is to fragment and diffuse the Nation's effort to end poverty. For us to pass this bill would be breaking faith with the poor; were we to do that, how long would it take us to break faith with the ideal of a democratic society itself?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. One of the reasons why we wrote in the provision that the administrative cost at the State level would be limited to 5 percent is because at the present time we find the administrative costs averaging 20 percent and—in some cases—much, much higher. This is one of the reasons why we say the money is not going to the poor and is not going to the people for whom it is intended.

In addition, as I pointed out earlier, over one-half billion dollars has gone to private corporations on supporting contracts, technical assistance, that could have been going for programs within the States to help those who really need it. This is an attempt to save money and to use it where needed.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, may I remind this body that the pending business is an amendment of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH); namely, to move in the area of Headstart. I speak a word in strong support of this amendment. The Headstart program, developed under OEO, has proven to be an excellent experimental program. As an excellent operating program it has been moved over to and delegated to HEW.

The motion of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) is aimed at continuing that operation if the substitute is adopted.

I urge this committee now to vote in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to ask for a vote on the Esch amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It would.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) to the substitute amendment

offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES).

The amendment to the substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the substitute amendment and all amendments thereto close at 6 o'clock.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman agree to let the last 5 minutes be reserved to the committee?

Mr. AYRES. Yes, I would agree to that.

Mr. PERKINS. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the substitute amendment and all amendments thereto close at 6 o'clock with the last 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The matter of the last 5 minutes being reserved to the committee may not be included in the motion.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that portion of the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OTTINGER) there were—ayes 124, noes 35.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AYRES

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin to the substitute amendment: Amend section 301(1) of the substitute to read as follows:

"(1) Clause (3) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the remainder of the members (which shall comprise not less than one quarter of the total membership of such board) are officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups or interests in the community, and are chosen by such groups or interests."

In section 301(2) of the substitute, the proposed first sentence of subsection (c) of the section 211 of the Act is amended by striking "appointed by the elected public officials who serve (or appoint representatives to serve) on the board of the community action agency," and inserting in lieu thereof, "appointed by elected local officials whose constituencies include significant portions of such area."

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, section 301(1) of the substitute does two things. First, it requires that those board members who serve as officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups and interests, constitute at least one-fourth of the total membership of the board. Second, it requires that these private-sector representatives be appointed by the elected public officials who serve on, or have representatives serving on, the board.

The requirement that these private sector representatives be selected by public officials would represent a very substantial change in the composition of community action agency boards. It would give the public officials seven-twelfths of the board membership. It would deprive the private sector of any real representation, since the board members would not be chosen as representatives of private groups. They would merely be representatives of public officials who happen to be officials or members of private groups.

This amendment to the substitute retains the requirement that at least one-fourth of the board members be representatives of private groups. That is a constructive suggestion to strengthen private sector participation in the poverty program. The amendment would eliminate the requirement that the private sector members be selected by public officials, however, and introduce instead a requirement that they be chosen by the private groups or interests themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) has expired.

Does any Member wish to address the Committee on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER)?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will just say to my colleagues that with an amendment like this, if there is any real problem in the provisions of the substitute to which the gentleman from Wisconsin addressed himself, it can be worked out in the conference.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) rise?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise with reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) is recognized.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's yielding.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 301(2)

The substitute bill provides that area boards and councils to which community action agencies delegate significant powers must have a membership of which at least one-third are public officials. The substitute provides that these public officials are to be appointed by the elected public officials who serve on the board of the community action agency.

This amendment to the substitute would preserve the requirement that one-third of the membership of such a board be elected public officials, and would also preserve the requirement that they be chosen by elected public officials. However, it would change the method of selection to provide that the public officials who make the selections be elected officials representing the area served.

In the case of a multicounty community action agency which delegates significant powers to the countywide boards, the substitute provides that the officials sitting on the multicounty board would choose the officials to sit on the individual county boards. In the case of a major city such as Chicago or New York, the substitute provides that elected officials sitting on the central board would choose the public officials to sit on each neighborhood board. The result would be that the public representatives on a council for one part of the city would be chosen partly by officials representing other parts of the city. This kind of top-down selection system could easily result in having public officials on area councils who are entirely unrepresentative of the areas served by these councils. This amendment would cure that defect by providing that the public representatives on area boards and councils be selected by elected officials whose constituencies include significant portions of the area in question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin), there were—ayes 26, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUSH TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSH to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: In section 201 of the substitute, section 253 (c) (1) is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a semicolon, and adding the following: "Provided further, That the Director shall reserve such sums as may be necessary to provide assistance for programs authorized under section 222(a) (6)."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would exempt the family planning programs from the State plan. President Nixon has named family planning as one of his national goals, and it is one that the Congress overwhelmingly supports. In my opinion, the best work that OEO does is in the area of family planning. They need all the funds that are earmarked. The funds they have used in the past have worked efficiently. They have worked without controversy. They have worked without disrupting anything. And I think it would be a shame to slow this national momentum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, upon reading the study recently released by the Office of Economic Opportunity, "Need for Subsidized Family Planning Services: United

States, Each State and County, 1968." I was distressed to learn that of the 5.3 million women in need of subsidized family planning services only 773,000 are being served. This is a serious situation that requires immediate action. I believe the OEO family planning program is taking the right approach in attacking this problem and therefore I am a strong supporter of the program.

However, this study also points out a very shocking statistic in regard to young people in this country: the rate of illegitimacy among teenagers has increased 60 percent over the last 20 years. Adolescents between 10 and 19 now account for 40 percent out-of-wedlock births. It is imperative that action be taken to stem this flood of unwanted children and ruined young lives.

In the past, publicly supported programs have only tried to help and counsel teenage girls after they have become pregnant. It is now apparent that this is not enough. Something must be done to prevent these pregnancies.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is presently developing ways of providing guidance and appropriate medical and contraceptive services to these sexually active teenagers. An example of this is a project in North Carolina which holds weekly sex information and counseling sessions for an average of 40 ghetto adolescents. Nonprescription contraceptives are made available to those in need.

OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld is proposing an increase in his budget for family planning from \$15 million to \$22 million this next year. He is doing so to enable OEO to expand and increase family planning services throughout the country. I believe OEO's present activities in this field justify such an expansion.

I commend OEO on its fine efforts in this vital area of health care, and support an expansion of its programs. Therefore, to place this successful program, which is just beginning to find ways to deal with previously unsolved social dilemmas such as the plight of the pregnant unmarried teenager, under rigid State control would seriously impede this excellent OEO program. It would be impossible for all 50 States to engage experts in the family planning field to continue the innovative programs that the competent OEO central family planning staff is now designing and operating.

I commend OEO on its valiant efforts in this field and show my faith in its family planning program by supporting Representative BUSH's amendment to the substitute bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BUSH. I am grateful to my colleague for yielding.

Family planning is different in many ways from other programs. It requires specialized people, people who are not available at this time in all of the States and in the numbers that are needed. We have already had a 6-month delay reaching this national goal of serving 5 million people in 5 years. We cannot afford any more delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bush amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago a report on a very important study came across my desk. It was entitled, "Need for Subsidized Family Planning Services: United States, Each State and County, 1968." This study showed that there were 4.6 million poor women in the United States who wanted and needed family planning information and services but were not getting them. Furthermore, this report showed that out of this group of 4.6 million women, there were 1.4 million who lived in smaller metropolitan and predominately rural areas in the United States.

As you all know, delivery of health care in this country has always been a difficult problem in rural areas. Because of transportation and communication problems, rural Americans have not always had the same opportunity to receive the benefits of our advanced medical technology. I am concerned therefore that 1.4 million poor women in rural areas of this country who need family planning services will be left out when programs are developed to meet family planning needs of other Americans.

It is for this reason therefore that I take this opportunity to commend OEO for its proposed new initiatives that take into account the necessity for bringing family planning to the rural poor.

OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld has indicated that he intends to expand the existing community action agency-administered family planning programs in rural as well as urban areas. Furthermore, he wants to initiate two new programs that will have as their focal point the 1.4 million rural women in the United States.

One program involves the introduction of family planning services into hospitals as a part of standard maternity care. Since over 97 percent of births in the United States take place in hospitals, it seems to me the natural place to introduce women to family planning. Furthermore, I understand that these postpartum programs, as they are called, are the most economic way of bringing family planning to potential acceptors. OEO is to be commended for adopting this approach, for it is indeed simple and practical.

The other new initiative of OEO's family planning program in rural areas is its effort to involve private and group practice physicians. In those rural counties where health resources are at a premium it seems only fitting that existing resources should be used maximally. OEO proposes to ask private and group practice physicians to give family planning information and services in their own offices on a fee-for-services basis. This again makes good sense to me because it shows a cost consciousness that unfortunately is not characteristic of many health programs today.

It will certainly not be an easy task to reach 1.4 million women in rural America. Therefore, I congratulate OEO for its imagination and initiative in developing logical approaches to bring family

planning to this group. I am further impressed, as I am sure you will be, with the emphasis that OEO's family planning program is placing on program economy. The problem of reaching rural America and the problem of doing it economically are vital issues.

It is for these reasons that I am a strong supporter of OEO's family planning program, and why I am concerned about its future today. The necessity for involvement of new agencies and innovative techniques and the very short supply of family planning experts make "State programming" of family planning programs entirely unfeasible. Such a blow to the OEO family planning effort would long delay, if not actually prevent, the effective delivery of family planning education and services to those rural women who desire and so greatly need subsidized family planning services. For this reason I fully support Representative BUSH's amendment to the substitute bill to exempt family planning programs from the State plan, I urge you to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time I have remaining to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on July 18, 1969, President Nixon sent a detailed message on population and family planning to the Congress. This is the first such message by an American President. It reflects a commendable effort to focus the attention of the Nation on these important issues.

In defining the role of the Office of Economic Opportunity the President has asked OEO to determine ways in which OEO can best structure and extend its program in order to help achieve our national goal of providing "adequate family planning services within the next 5 years to all those who want them but cannot afford them."

The way that individuals can determine the number and spacing of their children is an essential element in improving the health and economic well-being of the poor. OEO's family planning program seeks to provide an alternative for poor women burdened by unplanned and unwanted pregnancies that endanger their health and keep their families locked in the poverty cycle. Participation is entirely voluntary, and in keeping with the individual's religious and social beliefs. Emphasis is placed on providing a dignified and professional atmosphere as well as maintaining the confidence and trust of the participant.

The characteristics of each OEO project differ, depending upon the needs and resources present in the local community. In all cases, the highest medical standards are maintained and a complete spectrum of services is provided. Babysitting facilities, nighttime clinic sessions, transportation to and from clinic locations, and referrals to social agencies for other services are common features of OEO-supported projects.

Approximately 230 community action agency-administered projects have been funded by OEO regional offices to date, two-thirds in urban areas, one-third in rural areas.

Approximately 45 percent are operated directly by CAA's, 37 percent are delegated for operation to Planned Parenthood Affiliates, 15 percent to health departments, and the remainder to a variety of other local agencies. The average project budget is \$70,000, 70 percent provided by OEO.

Excluding the projects in Puerto Rico, the total program was attracting 10,500 new "acceptors" per month, as of October, 1968.

The President asked that OEO strengthen its innovative programs and pilot projects in the delivery of family planning services to the needy. In this regard, technical assistance is being provided, under a contract, to the 230 OEO funded service projects. Family planning specialists are available to assist projects in such fields as project development, program analysis, medical services, and recordkeeping.

In addition, through a \$1.9 million grant the Population Council will support and coordinate family planning projects at 14 medical schools. Each school has an in-hospital family planning program that will be expanded. Most schools will establish new satellite clinics. Other special projects include adolescent pregnancy programs in cooperation with local boards of education, premarital counseling services, and involvement of Neighborhood Youth Corps and family life centers in family planning. Total target population is 400,000; 75,000 women will be served in this first year of operation. In Los Angeles, an effort is being made to coordinate and add support to those agencies in the Los Angeles area that offer family planning services. It is the first time that joint planning and coordination of services has been attempted in an entire metropolitan area in this country.

The President directed that OEO work with HEW in coordinating all domestic family planning programs, in surveying efforts to attract people to work in population and family planning programs, and in training them properly.

To this end, representatives of OEO, Planned Parenthood/World Population, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have designed a standard family planning patient data form that is to be used by service projects supported by all three agencies. OEO projects are already using this system and it is hoped that all HEW and PF/WP projects will also be participating by the end of the year. When this program becomes fully operational early next year, it will be the first time that comparable data will be available on family planning patients enrolled in programs sponsored by several different organizations and agencies.

In summary, OEO's family planning programs are preventive, needed, and well received. They have one of the most favorable cost benefit ratios of any federally sponsored health activity. In view of the high priority given to family planning by President Nixon, and the outstanding success of the OEO program in providing this vital service to thousands of poor people, I urge you to support Congressman BUSH's amendment concerning family planning programs. I

believe this amendment will enable OEO to extend its efforts in this area as rapidly and efficiently as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time I have remaining to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH).

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, again, it is very difficult to continue under these restricted time requirements. There is a great sensitivity involved in this subject of family planning. The Congress, the Federal Government, and the OEO are ahead of most of the State governments in this area. I think it is a very different program, and I strongly urge that this exemption be granted and that full funding be granted through OEO of this program. We cannot afford delay.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to speak on the Bush amendment? If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 75, noes 26.

So the amendment to the substitute amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. GUBSER TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the desk which I offer, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. GUBSER to the substitute amendment: Immediately following section 302, insert the following:

"LIMITATION ON LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

"Sec. 303. Section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out 'counseling, education, and other appropriate services' and inserting in lieu thereof 'legal counseling, education in legal matters, and other appropriate legal services.'"

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

Immediately following section 302, insert the following:

"LIMITATION ON CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATED TO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

"Sec. 303. The fourth sentence of section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting '(A)' after 'this part' shall be utilized' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', or (B) for any activity not directly related to the provision of services referred to in the first sentence of this paragraph and litigation on behalf of specific clients shall be conducted in accordance with the canons of professional ethics of the American Bar Association.'"

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized in support of his amendments.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I do not have time to thoroughly argue for the amendments, but I do take the 30 seconds to establish a legislative history.

There is a change in the second amendment from what appeared several days ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My intent will be clearly spelled out as I revise and extend my remarks.

Second, for the purpose of establishing legislative history, I want it clearly known that it is not the intention of either of these amendments to outlaw so-called class lawsuits.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman brought his amendments to us. Counsel has gone over them very carefully. We can accept the amendments of the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do so for two reasons.

First, given the conditions of this debate, as the gentleman from California mentioned, it is rather difficult to know what in the world his amendments do. If I understood them correctly from the few seconds afforded this body to hear them, in effect they restrict the operation of the legal services program to enabling poor people to level suits against other poor people.

I hope the amendments will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from California (Mr. WIGGINS) rise?

Mr. WIGGINS. In support of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's name on the list read by the Chair?

Mr. WIGGINS. I do not believe it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot be recognized, then, under the time limitation.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER), to the substitute amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES) there were—ayes 65, noes 73.

So the amendments to the substitute amendment were rejected.

AMENDMENT TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEDS

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEEDS to the substitute amendment: In section 201 of the substitute, section 253(c)(1) is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a semicolon, and adding the following: "Provided further, That the Director shall reserve such sums as may be necessary to provide assistance for programs to be conducted on Federal Indian reservations."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK yielded his time to Mr. MEEDS.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose will exempt Indian community action programs from the effect of this substitute. I do so, and I think President Nixon will be happy to hear about this amendment because he said on September 27, 1968, when he was a candidate for the Presidency in Portland, Ore.:

The special relationship between the Federal Government and the Indian people and the special responsibility of the Federal Government to the Indian people will be acknowledged.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members of this body that the best thing that has happened to the Indians now living on reservations during the past 5 years has been the Office of Economic Opportunity programs which they are running on their own reservations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a portion of a letter which I have received from the National Congress of American Indians:

Turning administration of this program over to State governments would only probably mean its demise for most poverty groups. For Indians, the demise of the programs would be certain.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is no question about that.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the contents of the letter which I have received from the National Congress of American Indians.

The letter referred to follows:

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF
AMERICAN INDIANS,

Washington, D.C., December 12, 1969.

Re OEO-proposed Quile-Green amendment.
HON. LLOYD MEEDS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEEDS: Knowing your interest in strengthening the OEO program for the benefit of the nation's impoverished, I am writing to express the vigorous opposition of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) to the proposed Quile-Green amendment to the OEO authorization act.

As you know, we are composed of 118 tribes representing nearly 400,000 American Indians, having a yearly average annual income of \$1,500. The OEO programs serving American Indians have made a measurable impact in many Indian communities and have been among the most effective and least criticized of the OEO programs.

I have enclosed statistics setting forth the breakdown of funds expended to render various services to Indian communities, broken down by States. Separate and apart from these communities, OEO has programs operating in some areas on county-wide bases which also serve urban and some reservation Indians.

Turning administration of this program over to State governments would only probably mean its demise for most poverty groups. For Indians, the demise of the programs would be certain.

There is a long and well-established pattern of failure by State governments not only to provide to their Indian citizens the special services frequently needed, but even failing to provide those services which other citizens in the State take for granted.

When the crime control of 1968 was passed, providing money for law enforcement assistance, it routed money designated for Indian reservations thru State governments. In almost all instances, State governments have collected these funds from the Federal treasury, but have failed to provide services to reservations. Congress is presently con-

sidering amendments on both houses which would route funds for reservations directly to the tribal governments, a position we support. There can be no doubt that turning over the direction of OEO programs to the States can have no effect but to emasculate its effectiveness.

We strongly urge you to oppose the Quile-Green amendment, or, at the least, to exempt Indian program's from its effects.

We support a two-year extension of OEO, without amendment.

Thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully,

JOHN BELINDO,
Executive Director.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS yielded his time to Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to put in perspective the OEO program. The main purpose of this substitute amendment in relation to the total amount of Federal, State, and local funds being spent on the poor, the disadvantaged, is to try to bring about some coordination of multitudinous programs—to eliminate the scandalous waste of funds—to change this from an anti-Government program to an anti-poverty program in fact. We do not do away with OEO—but we would try to have the poverty funds actually go to help the poor.

Today in America we are spending for fiscal year 1970, according to a study done for OEO, \$27 billion.

Twenty-seven billion dollars in Federal funds and \$14.9 billion in State and local funds for the poor and disadvantaged people and we have \$2.4 billion in private funds earmarked for the poor.

In other words, we are spending in fiscal year 1970 over \$40 billion for this purpose. OEO's \$2 billion is only about 5 percent of the total effort. From the other programs, there are many similar efforts. Would not it be better to make it possible for the States to coordinate at that level what we cannot or will not do at the Federal level?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GIAIMO was allowed to yield his time to Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. So, Mr. Chairman, this effort on the part of those of us who offer the substitute is to try to make it possible for States to coordinate programs for the poor so that there will be more of the dollars actually going to them instead of duplicating our efforts and expending money on the high administrative costs, high salaries for poverty "specialists" who move from one program to another with the greatest of ease—and countless studies, reports, and evaluations.

The only argument I have heard today against the States—is that we cannot and must not trust the elected Governors, we must not trust the States, and some of these people who spoke so vehemently on this—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gen-

tlewoman from Oregon has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAGGONER was allowed to yield his time to Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, some of the people who have spoken so vehemently on this—do not trust your Governor; do not trust the States. The same people who said that today, in 1967 said that we must not trust city hall. The amendment then was to allow elected local officials to have a voice in the program. In 1967—"don't trust city hall." Today—"don't trust your Governor." These are strange words, strange advice from one branch of the Federal Government, contributing to the erosion of confidence in government as surely as the irresponsible militants who take to the streets to shout "no government can be trusted; no government is any good."

Rather, I would like to place my trust in those who have been elected by popular vote—than those who have been appointed and anointed as regional czars with absolute veto power in the regional office removed from the State and unfamiliar with its problems.

In the 1967 debate when it became the law—and still is—that a State could become a community action agency, the distinguished Speaker quoted and endorsed a proclamation by Governor Volpe which said in part:

Government has a basic responsibility for the economic well-being of all citizens in this State and Nation, and the State has the unique potential to effect necessary changes through cooperation with and coordination and utilization of the resources of the Federal and local governments as well as the private sector.

Let us not fear the elected representatives of the people—let us not continue to downgrade the chief officer of the State, the Governor. Let us start—from this day—to build a partnership that is responsive and responsible. The people cannot help but be the beneficiary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) to the substitute amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES) there were—ayes 90, noes 41.

So the amendment to the substitute amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TUNNEY TO THE
SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TUNNEY to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Strike out subsection (c) (1) of section 253 of section 201 of the Ayers amendment and insert the following:

"(c) (1) For any fiscal year in which any State has had in operation a State developmental and coordination program approved in accordance with this part the Director shall make available to such State for carrying out the approved program the sums allotted to such States for such year under section 225(a) and (b) *Provided, however*, That the Director may reserve up to one half of such amount to initiate and carry out special programs and assistance in such

States pursuant to section 222, where the Director has determined that such projects and activities are necessary to strengthen efforts toward the elimination of poverty or otherwise to further the purposes of this Act."

At the end of section 253, insert the following:

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the Director from developing and carrying on special programs and assistance pursuant to section 222 in States carrying out developmental and coordination programs."

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would reserve one-half of the funds allotted to the States under sections 225(a) and (b) to the Director, rather than one-fourth of the funds as is contained in the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) and it would allow the Director to initiate and carry out special programs in connection with efforts toward the elimination of poverty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be allotted to the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. TALCOTT. Objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment would be to allow those States that would like to have a legal services program, which legal services program is not contained in the State plan, to have such a program if the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity thought it was important and necessary. I feel that this is very important because there are many States that are going to try to attack the legal assistance program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE).

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY).

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is extremely important that this amendment be adopted, because I do feel that there are many States such as California where the Governor is opposed to the idea of a neighborhood legal service program. I think that this amendment would make it very clear that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity would have authority to assist local municipalities if they want a neighborhood legal service program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, since I was first elected to the House in 1962 I have directed my total effort at achieving a reallocation of this Nation's national priorities. In those 7 years we have made some very important basic steps toward this goal. A goal of providing a more meaningful and productive way of life for all of our citizens.

The establishment of the poverty program has been the primary foundation for providing the poor with the needed means to make them an active and productive segment of our society. It is only possible to have a healthy society if we are willing to continue the treatment until the illness is completely cured. I am confident that today we will continue to reaffirm our commitment to the eradication of the disease of poverty in this Nation.

There is a great deal which must be done to help the poor of this country now. It is not just a moral issue that is involved here. It is an economic issue as well. It is a question of how long this Nation can afford to continue with a substantial portion of our society deprived of a decent standard of living. And it is a question of how long our economy can continue to grow with such a large segment of the economy acting as a drag by its inability to become a productive part of the total system.

The poor are not just a burden to this country but are also a vast untapped resource of the Nation's potential wealth. However, as long as their potential contribution to our society remains a mere potential, the standard of decency for all our citizens will remain a mere potential. Today we must decide the future course of this Nation's efforts to win the war against poverty. We must look to our past efforts as our guide to the future. Our past efforts have been greater than those of our predecessors, but then the problems have been greater also.

In many cases our efforts have not been as well directed as we would like to admit. At the same time, our efforts have been increasingly effective and the results of those efforts increasingly rewarding.

We who support the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity are willing to point to its past deficiencies just as readily as the program's most vehement critics. We realize the poverty program needs many changes to improve its performance record. That record has not been bad, but neither has it been as good as we would like to see it.

I do not propose that we today leave the Office of Economic Opportunity legislation untouched. This legislation definitely needs to be greatly strengthened. But it needs to be strengthened in such a way as to allow the program to become more effective, not less. Not more effective in terms of pacifying its critics, but more effective in terms of helping the poor, making the program more cost effective and making the program really work to eliminate poverty in this country.

The steps that we have taken so far are very basic. They are the foundation upon which we can build our future efforts. They are the only signs of hope

that this country has in its fight against the disease of poverty that infests our country today.

I do not choose to stand by and watch as this foundation is attacked by those who do not seem overly anxious to eliminate poverty in this country. I do not wish to see the substitute bill enacted into law when it poses a most serious threat to the continuity of those efforts that we have just begun to make.

I realize that there are those who say that this substitute legislation will not destroy the poverty program. They say that it simply gives a larger role to the States in the antipoverty fight.

On the surface, this is what the substitute bill does. But, it is not necessary to look far beneath the surface to see that this bill will effectively cripple the OEO programs by increasing administrative costs, eliminating essential programs, and lessening the degree of local participation.

First let us look at the increased administrative costs.

The substitution bill will increase administrative costs substantially, perhaps as much as twofold. This State plan approach would result in a multiplicity of effort, duplicate staffing, and an unreasonable increase in administrative costs which would result in a decrease in the moneys actually available for program purposes.

It must be noted that the programs that would be turned over to the States by the substitute bill are not large operating programs. Their administration would be substantially less efficient if 50 State staffs were to replace the Federal staff now engaged in program administration. For example:

Legal services programs are budgeted at \$54.9 million. They operate in almost all States. They are administered by a Washington staff of only 35 professionals.

Comprehensive health programs are budgeted at \$74 million. Such programs will operate in 30 States and the District of Columbia, with only a single program in many of these States. These programs are administered by a Washington staff of only 23 professionals.

Programs for Indians are budgeted at \$22 million. They operate in 20 States. They are administered by a Washington staff of only nine professionals.

Follow Through programs are budgeted at \$58 million. They operate in almost all States. They are administered by a Washington staff of only 19 professionals.

If the States take over these programs as provided by the substitute bill, either the administrative costs will skyrocket or the program effectiveness will be greatly curtailed. I do not think the American public desire either of these alternatives.

It would be a travesty of justice if this Congress were to remove from the grasp of the poor the opportunity for them to help themselves escape from poverty. It would be equally unjust for this Congress to knowingly place an increased tax burden on the average citizen when such taxes already constitute an almost unbearable burden.

Second, let us look at an example of

programs that will be curtailed by institution of the substitute bill.

The substitute bill or State plan will in effect remove such programs as VISTA and VISTA lawyers from a great many States. It is not just administrative costs associated with recruiting, selection, training, support and supervision that would pose difficulties if separate programs were to be established in each State as provided by the substitute bill.

It is also the simple reality that applicants for VISTA are not evenly distributed. The colleges, from which VISTA receives most of its manpower, particularly skilled volunteers, tend to be centralized in the larger and more populous States. This is even more so of graduate schools, where VISTA is increasingly finding its volunteers—doctors, nurses, architects, lawyers, business school graduates, education specialists.

If States were to recruit only within their own boundaries for volunteers the smaller and frequently poorer and more rural States would be relatively starved for volunteers with technical skills.

VISTA now trains its volunteers in seven regional training centers. The cost of training now is low, the process is efficient. The proposal, however, would require creation of 50 training centers and the result would be the skyrocketing of training costs and the creation of a heavy overhead burden. Instead of efficiency the substitute bill promotes waste, new bureaucracies, and higher costs.

The substitute bill also provides that VISTA lawyers may be assigned only to legal services programs funded by the OEO, and that they may serve only in States in which they have been admitted to the bar.

VISTA legal personnel are not practicing law but merely performing quasi-legal work for the community.

There is no sound reason for prohibiting the assignment of VISTA volunteers with legal skills to useful programs which do work outside the scope of the legal services program. The fact of the matter is the current recruitment and assignment of VISTA lawyers has the strong support of the Director of OEO, and the legal services program and the backing and involvement of the ABA, the NLADA, and law schools and bar associations all over the country.

The restrictions that lawyers be assigned only to States in which they are admitted to the bar is not a rule applied to lawyers in private practice. It is typically permissible for a lawyer who has not been admitted to work under the supervision of a lawyer who has been admitted. There is no reason why lawyers in VISTA should be treated differently.

Last, the substitute turns over major policy determination functions to the State economic opportunity offices. Although most critics and supporters of OEO programs have urged a larger degree of participation by local communities in conduct and administration, the substitute bill does not specifically provide for this.

In fact, this legislation would substantially reduce local involvement and replace it with a decisionmaking hierarchy

at the State level. The community action programs are based upon the concept of participation by the poor in programs designed to assist them.

It is very questionable whether their active participation in these programs can be preserved in many States if the programs are turned over to the States.

It is significant that the Office of Economic Opportunity was established to fight poverty in the Nation at a time when the scope of the problem and the failure of the States to cope with it demanded action by the Federal Government.

I am afraid that much support for turning this program back to the States comes from those who do not necessarily want the States to carry out a program now being done by the Federal Government, but by those who do not want to see the program carried out at all.

The critics of the OEO program say that the program has not been as responsive to the States as it should have been in the past. The critics are right and there can be little doubt about it. But the answer is not to overrespond to such a degree that the program that we are trying to improve is in effect destroyed.

Since Mr. Rumsfeld has taken over as Director of the OEO, he has initiated many steps to bring the States more fully into the decisionmaking process in the establishment and operation of OEO programs within the various States. He has pledged to further increase these efforts.

The President in his recent news conference expressed his desire that the reforms pledged by Mr. Rumsfeld be given a chance to be carried out. I also urge this body to allow the OEO Director the flexibility to carry out his pledge.

The OEO program can and must be strengthened by passage of the enactment of substantial portions of the committee bill. This will continue the sound foundation upon which an efficient and responsive poverty program can expand.

I believe that the OEO, under the leadership of Mr. Rumsfeld has taken many steps to correct its past deficiencies and to expand the scope of its most effective programs.

The following list includes a number of major steps which have been taken in recent months by the Office of Economic Opportunity to heighten State involvement in antipoverty efforts:

A new Division of State and Local Government has been created and made directly responsible to the Assistant Director for Operations, who is a Presidential appointee. This office will help promote more effective relationships between State governments and field operations.

Within headquarters, the Associate Director for Congressional and Governmental Relations will have responsibility for maintaining effective liaison between the OEO Director and the 50 Governors and the National Governors Conference on matters affecting OEO and State relations generally.

An increase of nearly 30 percent in the basic funding level for State Economic Opportunity Offices has been included in the administration's budget request for fiscal year 1970.

A complete revision of the OEO direc-

tive on the "Role of State Economic Opportunity Offices" is being circulated to the Governors for review and comment. It provides for: Greater SEOO involvement in the preparation of the annual regional office funding plan for each State; SEOO participation in the monitoring and evaluation of OEO grantees; a strengthened checkpoint system to insure opportunity for the State to comment in the early stages of the grant application process; encouragement of State economic opportunity offices as potential grantees for demonstration or pilot programs; systematic consultation with the SEOO's in the training and technical assistance process; a requirement that regional offices shall work out a joint agreement with the SEOO's on the coordination of field personnel activities between the two offices; and, increased emphasis on the role of the SEOO as a mobilizer of State resources for use against poverty and as an advocate for the interests of the poor.

Preliminary discussions have been held with, and proposals have been received from a number of SEOO's with regard to innovative and experimental programs at the State level that they would like to undertake in a variety of areas. These include program evaluation and monitoring, analysis of State human resources programs from the point of view of their impact upon the poor, techniques of tapping private sector resources in the State for the poor, devices for coordinating State programs, economic development as a means to open up job opportunities for the rural areas, the need of the poor in State development district planning activities, and so forth. Plans are for at least 10 such demonstrations to get underway during fiscal year 1970.

A State special technical assistance program—STAP—has been initiated in three States. This program provides additional technical assistance staff capability to the SEOO's in such specialized areas as manpower, economic development, and management. Plans have been made to extend this program to an estimated total of 10 sites during fiscal year 1970.

A grant has been made to the Council of State Governments to provide technical assistance and other support to the State/STAP program. This is the first such grant that the council has accepted from any Federal agency.

Special planning grants have been made to 13 State economic opportunity offices for the purpose of strengthening their planning capabilities and maximizing the attention paid to the needs of the poor in statewide planning activities.

Funds have been set aside to bring the eight SEOO's whose present staffing authorization is below the level of five persons up to that number during fiscal year 1970.

Funds have been set aside for a training program for SEOO employees to enlarge both their technical skill level and their understanding of OEO structure and operations in particular and of the Federal Government in general. Concurrently, plans are being made to arrange for the training of OEO employees about

State government, perhaps with the assistance of an organization such as the Council of State Governments.

Planning is proceeding for a program of short-term exchanges of personnel between the SEOO's and the regional offices to improve personal relationships and to increase mutual awareness of systems, procedures and operating problems.

These steps which I believe will cure most of the OEO's past weaknesses are possible only by the adoption of a plan with the built in flexibility of the committee bill.

In the interests of a more meaningful way of life and the realization of an acceptable standard of living for all our citizens, I urge the rejection of this substitute bill and the speedy enactment of the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will extend the Economic Opportunity Act, more commonly known as the poverty bill. If the Congress acts favorably it will extend the war on poverty for a period of 2 years. The Education and Labor Committee has given ample consideration to this legislation by hearings, investigations, meetings, and so forth, during this year.

During this 3-hour debate the members of the Committee on Education and labor, who have had these extended hearings and investigations on the functions of this program have amply explained to the House the various sections for which this money will be expended. During its functioning the poverty program has not been perfect, like many other programs operated by Federal, State, or local governments, but nobody can expect a program as complex and complicated, and under so many departments and branches, caring for different functions of needy folks, to be 100 percent efficient. During the operation of the EOA relief and aid have been extended to millions. Under this bill the program has been extended to include specific work for career development programs; preschool and intensive follow-through education for primary school children and eliminating hunger and malnutrition. Areas which are affected by this legislation include work training and work study programs; urban and rural community action programs; special programs to combat poverty in rural areas; employment and investment incentives; work experience training and day care programs; and domestic volunteer service programs.

No doubt opponents who are endeavoring to curtail some of these necessary activities for the needy will set out different offices or localities where the program functioned poorly because of either mismanagement or inexperience of the directors.

These defects can and have been remedied in many cases were called to the attention of the top Federal directorship. Many Members of Congress opposing this program are aware that the \$3½ billion farm subsidy program which was

enacted this year by the Congress had many inexcusable segments of its operation which were defective and brought about waste of millions to large corporate farm operations who collect money fraudulently for vacant land by reason of mismanagement of the regional offices. Nevertheless, Members of Congress who enthusiastically supported that fabulous giveaway voted against limiting any one farm operation to \$20,000 annually regardless of waste and inefficiency. Here is a bill which calls for the expenditure of money that will aid millions of low-paid and unemployed families throughout the Nation who are helpless through no fault of their own.

I do hope that the Congress will not curb the operation of this great charitable endeavor to aid millions of the needy within the next 2 years by transferring control to the governments of the various States.

The success of a program of this type depends on continuation of personnel in order to streamline and function the various offices at the least possible cost.

I think the Members of Congress should support the request of President Nixon that this program not be jeopardized and curtailed by transferring the operation authority to State governments. It will bring about added and unnecessary expense and when the main Federal office has to distribute money to 50 Governors who, in some States have a term of only 2 years, it will be an indirect way of terminating a mammoth operation that requires direct and regular supervisors with experience and knowledge to carry out the work efficiently.

In President Nixon's TV newscast last Monday, he was asked the following question:

A move is under way in the House, and it's supported by the Republican leadership, to change the structure of the antipoverty program to give the Governors a veto over programs in their states. What is your position on that?

Senator HUGH SCOTT, minority leader of the Senate, placed the President's complete broadcast in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, December 9. It will hereby quote verbatim the President's answer:

I support the director of O.E.O. He has asked for a two-year extension. He has pledged to reform the O.E.O., and I think he should be given the chance to reform it. I hope he's able to work out with the leadership in the House, most of whom are Republicans in this instance who want the changes and some Democrats will be able to work out some kind of accommodation with them. But of course I support my director that I've appointed.

I do hope that the House will follow the leadership of the President of the United States and help our former colleague, Donald Rumsfeld, and pass this worthy program without amendments or change. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an editorial from the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune of October 22, 1969, concerning this major amendment of transferring power to the Governors of the States and particularly, the State of California.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Oct. 22, 1969]

A POOR PLOT

For once, California Sen. George Murphy is doing a song and dance routine that has a plot. The plot involves clamping a dangerous restriction on the Office of Economic Opportunity's power to help poor people get legal service they can't afford.

The script was apparently written by Gov. Ronald Reagan, another former Hollywood performer.

Murphy's amendment to a money bill, pushed through the Senate, would give governors the right to veto any legal service plan the OEO wants to start in their states.

Reagan hasn't fared well with OEO attorneys in his state, because the legal assistance they have given to migrant workers, especially, has frustrated some of his attempts to maintain the status quo.

The War on Poverty has touched more bases than those involving food, shelter and basic necessities. Protection of the law made available through expert legal help has also been denied poor people generally. They hunger for that too, and they deserve it.

The legal services plan has helped welfare mothers, slum tenants, even steelworkers, whose rights often have been brushed aside for lack of somebody to speak for them. Many landmark cases have hit the courts, a fact that some state and local officials view with varying degrees of irritation.

None has been troubled as much with the tide or progress as Reagan, who frankly doesn't like it.

Giving governors absolute veto over such programs would be a reactionary mistake. The House has a chance to correct the Senate's error, and we hope Northwest Indiana's representatives will get with it.

OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld is lobbying to get the amendment killed. He is enthusiastic about the legal services program. It has great promise, and should be allowed to flourish. Governors should have a say in federally-financed programs within their states, but they ought not have the power to block programs by whim.

California doesn't belong to Ronald Reagan alone, a fact he is finding out, and it irks him. But this case is bigger than California, for as California goes in this one, so goes the nation.

Sargent Shriver, former OEO boss, once said "Any program which enables the poor to do battle with the forces that oppress them at governmental expense has a high potential for conflict with the officials who make public policy affecting the poor. This is especially true where it is governmental action, often in programs designed to aid the poor, that is found to be oppressive."

What that means is that Murphy and Reagan have produced a bad show.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN).

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Green-Quie substitute to the Economic Opportunity Act would effectively gut that program by giving the State governments a veto power over OEO activities. It is hard to contemplate a Ronald Reagan or a Lester Maddox permitting any activity which would benefit the poor or the black. I believe OEO should be extended without major changes.

The OEO program has done much to improve the life of our previously forgotten low-income and minority citizens. It has given them an opportunity to develop their talents, create better com-

munities, and has put them in a better position to compete with other sectors of our society. It is this that has scared many who advocate the Green-Quie substitute.

Through the concentrated employment programs, for example, the young are being trained and placed in jobs. Through Operation Mainstream, the talents of the elderly are being productively employed. Through the job opportunities in the business sector program, the talents of business firms are being used to train and employ the previously unemployed; and under the new careers program, the untrained are being trained to performed subprofessional jobs which have a chance for advancement.

One OEO program of which I am particularly proud is the emergency small loan program. I authored this program. Under this program, individuals may borrow up to \$300 at 2-percent interest without collateral and with a minimum of investigation. The money is available to meet family emergencies. A woman in Texas, for example, obtained a loan with which to buy a special pair of shoes so that she could go to work as a nurse. She got the job and was able to pay back the loan. This program must be continued and I hope the amendment will not interfere with its continued funding.

The Green-Quie substitute would have the impact of making the antipoverty act into a State program in line with the administration's grand design to decentralize government. State Economic Opportunity Offices would receive all OEO applications before they are sent to OEO for funding. The State would have full authority to decide whether or not a program application should be approved. State economic opportunity councils would be created in each State with exclusive authority to develop an anti-poverty program for the State. Once the council creates the program and passes it on to the OEO Director, he would have to approve or reject it in total.

In addition to these general provisions, the substitute would restrict the OEO legal services program by requiring all VISTA attorneys to be part of the legal services program and a member of the bar in the State in which they serve. Also a court would be authorized to award legal fees and costs to the loser of a lawsuit initiated by the legal services program.

These provisions would erode or eliminate local or community control by allowing State politics to interfere with a program presently isolated from politics and by discouraging maximum participation of the poor by requiring members of community action boards and agencies to be appointed by elected officials.

The Green-Quie substitute makes the poverty program operate the same as education programs and welfare categorical assistance programs under HEW now operate. These programs have been the victims of noticeable proliferation of bureaucracy, unresponsiveness, and an inability to reach those in need of help.

The legal services program would be particularly victimized under this amendment. It would introduce politics into a program which is now insulated from

political pressures. This would present unsolvable conflicts of interest, as well as jeopardize the independence of the bar. It would punish legal services attorneys who lose a lawsuit by awarding legal fees and costs to losers of suits initiated by legal services. This provision which would discourage lawyers from initiating and fully pursuing cases is unnecessary since a present statute accomplishes the same thing without discriminating against legal services attorneys. It also multiplies the administrative costs of the program.

I shall vote against this substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHART).

Mr. ECKHART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important elements of the poverty program has been the legal aid services. It would be unconscionable to permit a State to destroy legal aid in a community without any valid reason. Yet if a vigorous legal aid service offends the State authorities, who may be defendants in a case, the defendant may retaliate by dismantling the lawyer force which represented the plaintiff under the Ayres amendment. The amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY) would prevent this. I would hope the Tunney amendment would pass, but I would still be against the substitute.

The substitute would permit States to dismantle the poverty program as it exists in each State involved. For instance, with respect to VISTA the substitute would only permit VISTA groups to be set up at all if they were established under grants to State or local public agencies. The State would effectively determine whether VISTA groups would come into being in the first place.

Under existing law VISTA groups come into being under the Office of Economic Opportunity. However, local control of VISTA groups is presently assured, and a VISTA group cannot be set up at a particular place without the written consent of the Governor. But the State may not prevent even the initial existence and recruitment of VISTA volunteers.

I think the program, even with present restrictions, has worked pretty well in Texas.

There are at present 272 VISTA volunteers working in Texas—more volunteers than in any other single State. They are assigned to 13 different projects, all sponsored by local community action agencies, churches, and local self-help organizations. Despite this relatively large number of volunteers VISTA, limited by budget, has not come close to filling requests. Sponsoring organizations in Texas have asked for 699 volunteers, to be used on 47 proposed projects.

Texas is not one of our richer States. It ranks 34th in income. There is severe poverty in both urban and rural areas. There are many separate poverty problems in Texas. The poor black in Houston, the Mexican American in the slums of Laredo, the migrant worker who lives

in a shack in south Texas need different approaches, different kinds of help.

What is VISTA trying to accomplish in Texas? Four of the 13 current projects are in rural areas. Education, in the broadest sense of the word, is vital among the rural poor, most of whom are Mexican Americans whose only income comes from migrant work and seasonal farm labor. There are many rural areas where the average annual income of families is less than \$3,000 a year. The median education level might be as low as 3.9 years. Functional illiteracy reaches as high as one-quarter of the population.

VISTA volunteers tutor schoolchildren, and school dropouts. They have organized adult basic education classes and literacy programs. They have set up day-care centers, freeing the mothers for work, and teaching preschoolers English so that they will be better able to function in the English language, Anglo-culture school system. Fifty-three VISTA's in Texas are working with thousands of poor people in a viable effort to expand their horizons—to help the poor help themselves. And they do. Poor people, with the initiative provided through VISTA programs, have continued the operation of day-care centers, set up food commodity programs, petitioned for sewage systems, obtained running water and gas lines to their homes, had streets paved and repaired houses, set up fumigation programs against rats and insects—in short, have come nearer to reaching a decent standard of living through their own efforts.

These are small projects, but they are far reaching. Ill-fed, ill-housed, under-educated people cannot make substantial changes all alone. Particularly in rural areas VISTA's deal with these basic problems. In the cities, problems are multiplied. There volunteers are involved in similar activities, attacking basic housing and education deficiencies. But they are also fulfilling the more complicated needs of the urban poor.

VISTA's, many of them lawyers, architects, business school graduates, are able to engender programs to help meet the needs of urban dwellers. In Austin, for example, half of the 16 volunteers assigned to that city are professional people.

VISTA volunteers, working with community groups, have been able to develop economic self-help projects—credit unions, food-buying clubs, and cooperatives. Directly through VISTA, thousands of poor have involved themselves in model cities decisions that affect their neighborhoods. Volunteers work with health clinics, community centers, day-care centers. They have organized teen clubs, recreational facilities, and programs for the elderly. Dozens of educational projects—preschool classes, tutoring, adult education courses, bilingual and literacy classes are set up and taught by VISTA's. The list is lengthy. These volunteers in Texas come from all over the United States. Some are professionals, some have a general college background, some are poor themselves and work in their own neighborhoods.

It was a group of these community VISTA volunteers in Del Rio, Tex., who were involved in the only project ever canceled by a Governor in any State during VISTA's 5 years of operation. Last March, the Val Verde County commissioners, where Del Rio is located, asked Gov. Preston Smith to cancel the VISTA program in Del Rio. He did, as he pointed out, because the county officials asked him to.

Another group of VISTA's were asked to leave Brownsville. They did. Their project was an interesting, complex, and obviously, controversial one.

Among other things the Brownsville VISTA's:

Taught citizenship classes in Brownsville, San Benito, and Raymondville, to over a hundred people who wanted to become American citizens but never knew how to.

Tutored and set up tutoring programs in Brownsville in several elementary schools for over 300 elementary school children.

Organized and put together a multi-purpose center and clinic in Port Isabel.

Talked a local doctor into going to Port Isabel every other Wednesday and give medical help to the poor.

Publicized and brought people to three tuberculosis clinics throughout the county.

Assisted at the Settlement House in Brownsville 8 or more hours a day doing everything from janitor work to playing with the kids.

Worked with the new retarded children's school in Brownsville.

Built two youth centers in Raymondville.

Built a youth center in San Benito.

Organized a cooperative food buying club in the southmost area in Brownsville so that the poor could fight inflation.

Helped paint, fix plumbing and did electrical work on the several houses which the city had moved and dumped on the corner of 12th and Grant Street.

Organized a dance in Garden Park so that the proceeds could be used for the children of Garden Park to have a party.

Took the kids from the Maura Smith Day Care Center to see the planes at the Confederate Air Force and the Harlingen Airports.

Took a bunch of kids to see the Elks' Club "Calvacade of Stars" and bought their tickets out of their \$90 a month salary.

Organized a small weekly newspaper in San Benito which had such controversial things as "Recipes to Fully Utilize Surplus Foods," "A Weekly Report of the Sullivan School's Principal," the announcement of meetings, citizenship classes, etc.

Organized car pools to bring poor people from Port Isabel to Brownsville to the county clinic, doctors, surplus foods' department.

Organized a carpool to take the poor from Brownsville to the mental health clinic in Harlingen.

Took a family of nine kids to Houston to visit their mother who eventually died of leukemia.

Drove a dying man in rush against

death to the M. D. Anderson Hospital in Houston. He had asked help from the county, but the county said, "We are only allowed to pay for the transportation of dead bodies."

Organized a Girl Scout and Brownie troop in San Benito for poor kids.

Spent hours upon hours, days upon days, visiting homes, struggling with a language, trying to help where help is needed.

After this VISTA withdrawal the Reverend Jon Bourg, of Brownsville, wrote a letter of protest to Governor Smith. The Governor, in reply, expressed the hope that:

The time will come when the local leadership, both public and private will have found the appropriate role for these volunteers and incorporated them again in their local system for both understanding and ministering to the problems of poverty in Cameron County.

The point here does not concern the merits of the case—whether the programs were good or bad—though there are many who will argue that they were excellent. The point is that here is a practical example of local and State control at work.

Under existing law a VISTA program exists in many localities in Texas. VISTA volunteers are ready and willing to work and are accepted gladly in most of the communities by all who deal with them. As the Governor has said, they will doubtless someday come back to Brownsville.

But under the Ayres substitute, the VISTA program might well not even exist in Texas. Had it been law from the beginning, there would have been no chance for VISTA to have proved itself. And I would hope that authority to destroy it altogether would not be given to the State of Texas. It is enough that State and local authorities may determine where it may be active.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY) to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TUNNEY), there were—ayes 83, noes 101.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TUNNEY and Mr. QUIE.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 125, noes 156.

So the amendment to the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) in the nature of a substitute?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OTTINGER to the amendment offered by Mr. AYRES:

In section 201 of the substitute, section 253(c)(1) is amended by striking the pro-

viso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *Provided, however,* That the Director shall reserve such sums as may be necessary to provide assistance for programs in political subdivisions which, in accordance with section 210(e), have elected not to be included in the State developmental and coordination program."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) to the substitute amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) there were—ayes 114, noes 141.

So the amendment to the substitute amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITE TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AYRES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: After section 303 insert the following:

"Sec. 504. Section 222(a) of such Act is further amended by adding to the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) A 'Narcotic Addict Recovery' program designed to discover and bring about post and/or pre-institutional treatment for narcotic addiction. Such a program shall be community based, with appropriate participation by parents, youth, educators and others in the community, serve the objective of maintaining the family structure as well as the recovery of the individual addict, encourage the use of neighborhood facilities and the services of former addicts as program workers and facilitate the re-entry of addicts into society. Such a program shall also emphasize the coordination and full utilization of existing community services which pertain to the treatment of addiction and/or related disorders."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE) to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 87, noes 98.

So the amendment to the substitute amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANDALL TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AYRES

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDALL to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Immediately following section 302, insert the following:

"APPLICABILITY OF CANONS OF ETHICS IN LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

"Sec. 303. (a) The second sentence of section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting '(A)' after 'assures' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and (B) that the Canons of Professional Ethics promulgated by the American Bar Association will be complied with'.

"(b) Section 222(a)(3) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall receive any complaints or allegations

which may be made concerning the conduct of programs under the second sentence of this paragraph, insofar as they relate to matters involving subject matter cognizable by the courts of the United States. The Director of such Office shall make an annual summary of such complaints or allegations, which shall be objective in character and without evaluation or comment. Such summaries shall be available upon request to a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, and shall, at least once each year, be submitted to the Senate and House of Representatives."

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) to the substitute amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANDALL) there were—ayes 124, noes 88.

So the amendment to the substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, the Murphy amendment, which was adopted by the Senate, would restore final responsibility for the OEO legal services to the Governors. It would authorize each Governor to determine how best to channel legal service programs in his State. In line with President Nixon's concept of the new federalism, the elected chief executive would exercise more control over the services in his State than the nonelected Washington official. At present, the decision as to whether a specific project is a proper function of the legal service now rests with an appointed bureaucrat. The Murphy amendment would shift that final determination to the chief elected State official.

The OEO legal service was set up to provide legal assistance on an individual basis for those too poor to afford a lawyer. It has instead expanded rapidly into the so-called law reform area at the expense of the individual legal aid services. In so doing it has far exceeded—one might even say, perverted its original purpose. Examples abound everywhere.

Suits financed by the war-on-poverty lawyers have sought to persuade the U.S. district courts in Newark, N.J. and Philadelphia, Pa., to appoint Federal receivers to run the local police department. The Philadelphia suit also asked to nullify State laws against carrying concealed deadly weapons, sedition, riot, conspiracy, loitering, and obstructing justice.

In Atlantic City, the legal service program is challenging the constitutionality of the New Jersey Narcotics Act and is contesting the State law requiring dove users to register with the police.

In Indianapolis, Ind., the local legal service program distributes several thousand cards in the city's low-income neighborhoods giving advice on the "art of noncooperation" with the police.

Students on OEO-financed fellowships in poverty law at the University of Pennsylvania held the national OEO legal service director captive in his sixth-floor office for 4½ hours. Later, these self-styled defenders of the law were arrested by the Washington, D.C., police.

In Washington, D.C., the OEO legal service was instrumental in changing the regulations of the National Capital Housing Authority so that low-income couples

who are not legally married or free to marry are now eligible for public housing. Furthermore, the neighborhood legal services program will continue to press the suit on the grounds that the provision is still too vague and discriminates in favor of married couples.

Under the new regulation, the unmarried couple must prove that theirs is a stable relationship.

In Detroit, Mich., and virtually every other riot-torn city, legal service lawyers have devoted inordinate amounts of time and effort to defending alleged rioters. The Essex County, N.J., grand jury, after a thorough inquiry into the 1967 Newark riot, said that witnesses "denied in whole or in part having made statements attributed to them" by the local legal service program. A number of the statements taken and finally supplied to the jury by legal services were unsigned. The grand jury concluded:

During the excitement many of those taking statements from persons involved in the riots either deliberately or unconsciously distorted these statements and in many ways conducted themselves so as to create in the minds of the public a biased and inaccurate impression of many events connected with the disturbances.

The Dallas legal services project began organizing welfare mothers in Dallas to demonstrate and protest. On November 26, 1968, the demonstrators staged a sit-in. A court ordered them to leave the welfare office. They refused. Twenty-one of them, including Mrs. Ruth Jefferson, leader of the mothers, were given 3-day suspended jail sentences for contempt.

In July of 1969, the Dallas Housing Authority served a notice of eviction on Mrs. Jefferson at the request of 300 of her fellow tenants on the following grounds: First, she owed \$415.28 in back rent on her \$52-a-month apartment; second, she used the apartment as a meeting hall for militants; third, her presence in the project was a threat to other tenants who feared injury because of her activities; and fourth, she permitted persons other than herself and her children to reside in the apartment.

On November 3, 1969, Ruth Jefferson was taken onto the Federal poverty-war payroll at \$5,400 a year plus "car expenses," as a community organizer in the west Dallas housing project from which she had been evicted. Robert Medrano, head of the West Dallas Poverty War Center, said Mrs. Jefferson was hired because of "her past performance as a community organizer."

The community lawyer fellowships, funded by the OEO through the University of Pennsylvania Law School, provide for 1-year assignments to work with local legal services throughout the country. Two of these fellows, assigned to Corpus Christi, Tex., were quoted as saying that they regret the lack of militance among the local poor people.

In California, a legal service attorney has appeared as counsel to challenge the right of a school district to set reasonable rules for the hair length of boys in high school. How ridiculous can you get?

At the Modesto, Calif., Junior College, a suit was filed in behalf of a Mexican-American club protesting a college requirement that all club members pay the

student body fees of \$8 per semester in order to be recognized by the school.

Mr. Roy G. Mikaken, president of the college, said:

Those six lawyers in the Modesto area seem to be more interested in "anti" movements against public agencies.

The California Legal Association has also filed a suit to compel Brawley's City Council and Board of Education to permit students to wear the berets and insignia of the Brown Berets in school.

Last year in Hartford, Conn., the OEO authorized a grant of \$272,443 to a company which existed only on paper called the "Connecticut Law Reform." The request for the grant was drafted by Howard Orenstein, legal services consultant to the OEO, who made himself director of the organization at \$20,000 a year. When this story broke, the ensuing public outcry and investigation resulted in a declaration by the GAO that the grant was illegal.

Although no publicly funded legal assistance service society is supposed to accept fee-producing cases, the California legal service has filed a number of such suits while refusing services to the truly eligible. It has on many occasions filed a number of suits involving the same or similar courses of action—in effect harassing individual citizens and agencies. The California program has moved so far down the road to legal reform that it, as a tax-financed agency, is suing other Federal-funded agencies as well as private citizens. At the same time it is closing down bona fide legal aid projects because, after the funds for legal reform are allotted, not enough is left for basic legal aid projects.

In Waterloo, Iowa, the OEO-funded legal service once intended to file suits against State colleges in Iowa which require students to pay parking fines as a condition of continuing as a student. They also said that they had intended to "instigate a grassroots organization of ADC mothers to develop political power which could be used to change community attitudes."

The St. Louis legal services has engaged in activities to suit their own sociological theories rather than to provide legal aid in civil cases for the poor. It has defended and counseled local militant groups which have participated in illegal demonstrations and disorders in that city. In some cases the militant defendants have incomes well above the level which would qualify them as poor.

The unlicensed director of legal services, Denison Ray, is currently receiving a \$28,000 salary that is substantially higher than that now received by a member of the Missouri Supreme Court, the attorney general of Missouri, or the mayor of St. Louis. Mr. Ray, together with 20 percent of his staff of attorneys, has been refused permission to appear in Federal court because he is not a member of the State bar. The remaining three nonbar lawyers receive between \$11,500 and \$18,000 as staff attorneys.

T. Hartley Pollock, who did much to establish the legal aid program in St. Louis, called the present policy of the society "a complete departure from the basis on which the program was organized."

The Murphy amendment would make such unauthorized departures much more difficult. Although OEO programs would continue to function on a local level, their projects would be subject to the Governor's veto.

The responsibility for whether the taxpayers should subsidize suits which involve the right of a school board to set reasonable standards on hair length; or whether a State's narcotics laws are valid; or whether the Federal Government should take over a local police force; or whether a group of militants should be subsidized to attack churches, schools, store owners, or the Government must ultimately rest with some public official.

This amendment simply states that the elected chief executive responsible to the people should be allowed to exercise his obligation free from bureaucratic interference.

Public administration will soon come to a standstill in this country if every act of government is subject to a prolonged lawsuit brought by tax-paid lawyers are more often political than philanthropic.

On Saturday, November 29, an article appeared in the Des Moines Tribune quoting Iowa Gov. Robert D. Ray as being opposed to the Murphy legal aid amendment. Two days later his top legislative assistant, Elmer Vermeer, called my office requesting material concerning the amendment. He said:

The Governor does not understand the Murphy amendment and he needs background material explaining its provisions.

No mention was made of the article in the Des Moines Tribune.

Later that same day, a constituent from my district called me regarding the stand that Governor Ray took on the Murphy amendment. I immediately called the Governor and asked him if he had read the amendment. He replied, "No, I have not."

This is typical of reaction throughout the country. Many who have not even read the amendment have voiced their opposition to it. The Governor of Iowa fits squarely in this category. He should take time to read an amendment before venturing to oppose it. It would be well for him to document his opposition as thoroughly as its advocates can support their position.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican substitute to H.R. 12321. The proposed transfer of the antipoverty program to the States would effectively cripple the program and transform it into a hodgepodge of unrelated efforts. In effect, each State would have an effective veto over the program and the Office of Economic Opportunity would be an administrative eunuch with little or no purpose except to passively await State decisions.

This action on the part of the minority contradicts their own President who announced that OEO was to serve as the central research and development agency for Government poverty programs. Logic defies this possibility if OEO is transformed into a holding agency with little or no structure or content.

More importantly, the Republican sub-

stitute could effectively thwart whatever progress has been made toward developing local participation in the poverty programs. Rather than democratizing the program, as the supporters contend their substitute would achieve, the substitute would have the effect of eroding and eliminating local or community control by allowing State politics to interfere with the program and by discouraging maximum participation of the poor by requiring members of the community action boards and agencies to be appointed.

Additionally, the legal services program, one of the most successful components of the antipoverty program, would be adversely affected by the substitute. Administrative costs would multiply under the substitute, legal services attorneys would be intimidated by the provisions allowing a court to award legal fees and costs to the loser of a lawsuit initiated by the legal services program, and politics would be interjected into the program.

If there are problems with the poverty program, the substitute proposal is not the way to handle them by creating 50 separate approaches. This creates an administrative nightmare and does little to further the goals of a national commitment toward eliminating poverty and injustice.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, at a time when this country must redouble its efforts to eradicate poverty, a threat has arisen to undermine the entire crusade. Sadly enough, this menace has originated in the Congress, so the very least we owe to the public is to choke off the threat at its roots.

There are many reasons for supporting the 2-year extension of OEO. OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld has recognized the poverty organization's weaknesses and deserves the time to attempt to correct these deficiencies. President Nixon has voiced his preference for such a course, although I note with dismay that he has not backed Mr. Rumsfeld vigorously during the crucial days immediately preceding our vote.

It is not so much OEO's strengths, although they are considerable, but the Green-Quie amendment's weaknesses which provide the most dramatic case for rejection of the substitute bill.

With the increasingly rapid decay of our cities, the shocking exposes of mass hunger, and the rising discontent among oppressed and disadvantaged minorities, there is a special sense of urgency to meet the poverty problem headon and in the most pragmatic fashion possible.

We need not ponder whether this substitute bill that shifts major decision-making power to the State governments is a cynical sabotage of the national drive to reduce poverty. It is enough to say that the proposal is unrealistic and unworkable.

If all the States were equipped with the necessary apparatus and personnel to administer successful antipoverty programs and were determined to do so, the amendment before us might not be so unpalatable. But again, there is great disparity among the States.

Indeed if the States showed this kind of commitment and ability, there would

be no need for any Federal antipoverty programs.

Mr. Chairman, let us turn for a moment to the strengths of OEO. This Government unit was specifically created to bypass not only the State but also Federal bureaucracies. It was designed to apply innovative approaches to problems that Federal and State agencies were either unwilling or unable to solve.

The President's message on OEO recognized that this agency was set up outside of the bureaucratic morass of redtape in order to prod Federal and State governmental units into action.

Under the Quie-Green amendment, who would be the catalyst for States derelict in their responsibilities to the poor?

States rights are important and must be preserved, but not at the expense of individual rights; namely, those of our Nation's indigent. All governmental rights in our society must ultimately be based on the rights of citizens to equal opportunity, including economic opportunity.

Of particular concern to me is the amendment's emasculation of OEO's legal services division, which has been so important in defending the poor against inequitable treatment from both public and private sources.

The provisions in the amendment would inhibit VISTA attorneys in their work and in effect, deprive the poor of legal counsel which has proven a major tool in their uphill struggle to enter the mainstream of our society.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, alcoholism ranks as the third major health problem in the Nation, afflicting at least 5 million adults. In addition, the families of alcoholics involve an average of three to four other persons. Even at that, we may only be seeing a portion of the problem. A neighborhood survey by one community action agency showed that one family out of every three had a problem with alcohol.

Perhaps more than any other vicious disease, alcoholism afflicts the whole man and the whole society. It disrupts the family, the church, and the school. And, it seriously disables the economy.

Alcoholism has a particularly heavy impact on persons and families already burdened with the multiple conditions of poverty. As in most other instances, the poor have less access to community services and facilities for alcoholics.

The chronic alcoholic is not likely to complete a job-training program or to look after his family's food and health needs even when welfare help is available. Also, the alcoholic and his family have frequently been excluded from community services simply because of the fact of alcoholism; in effect, they are punished rather than treated for illnesses.

Of particular concern are the most common effects of alcoholism; first, disruption of family life, and second, loss of employment and decreased employability.

In these two areas, alcoholism has the most impact of perpetuating individuals and families in poverty. To meet these problems, the most effective interven-

tions are before the person has reached the bottom, that is, while there are still family ties and prospects for employment to provide incentive for achieving rehabilitation.

Multiservice centers operated by community action agencies and neighborhood health centers are key points of contact for the low-income alcoholic and his family. By virtue of their structure and orientation, these agencies are ideally suited to provide services for the alcoholic which are truly responsive to his and his family's needs. They are oriented toward alcoholism as a problem related to the conditions of poverty and contributing to the continuation of poverty. Further, they are peculiarly capable of dealing with alcoholism as a community problem and mobilizing needed community resources.

The primary purpose of an alcoholic counseling and recovery program is to develop services for alcoholics and their families, aimed at inducing and maintaining sobriety for the alcoholic, and providing comprehensive services to the alcoholic and his family through effective relationships with other ongoing programs such as health services, vocational rehabilitation, and employment, and welfare assistance.

The potential for using OEO funds and facilities to help individuals and families at the poverty level to gain relief from this dread disease already exists. However, in order to maximize this potential, a national focus is needed to establish standards and encourage the development of local activities. This effort has been initiated and will be expanded during the coming year.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Murphy amendment adopted in the other body.

I support the substitute for the committee bill.

This means that I am satisfied that there is nothing in the substitute which is either substantially or procedurally the equivalent of the Murphy amendment.

Categorically, I say that under the substitute, the Governor does not have an absolute veto over legal services. He does not have a case-by-case veto power over legal services. And he has no line-item veto of any kind.

The substitute gives the Governor the power to concur or not to concur with his own State economic opportunity office when it disapproves an application for a legal services program. His concurrence in the disapproval does not constitute a final veto. The Director of OEO can override the disapproval. In cases where the application originated with a local community action agency, all that is required to justify the override is a finding that approval of the application would strengthen the overall program of the local community action agency. In cases where the application originated with other eligible applicants, the Director can override the disapproval upon finding that approval of such application would be in furtherance of the purposes of the act.

This burden the Director must bear is scarcely greater than the burden the present override law puts upon him.

The language in section 251(c)(1) of the substitute is not the Murphy amendment, either in form or effect, and nowhere else in the substitute will such be found.

Let me explain why I am opposed to the Murphy amendment.

A Governor ought not have the power to frustrate the citizen's opportunity for counsel when a lawsuit is brought against him, either by another citizen or by the government. Neither should a Governor have the power to frustrate the citizen's opportunity for counsel when, except for his poverty, that citizen has cause and standing to bring a lawsuit against another citizen or against the government.

A Governor's power to veto a routine poverty war program is one thing. A Governor's power to veto a legal services program is another. The exercise of the former is purely administrative in both function and effect. The exercise of the latter is administrative in function but judicial in effect.

When a Governor vetoes a routine community action program, he has made a judgment that an executive program will not be administered. When a Governor vetoes a legal services program, he has made a judgment that the judicial process will not be permitted to function fully. Such a judgment fractures the system of division of powers.

The judicial process must be protected against trespass. This is because the judicial process is the only mechanism by which citizen wrongs can be redressed and citizen rights can be enforced. If the judicial process is not independent of executive restraint, the mechanism can fail, especially if the executive branch of government is involved in citizen wrongs or citizen rights.

The judicial process is a mechanism fashioned for all men. But it is not always fully available to all men. Too often, it is available only to those who can afford the lawyer's fee. True, the judicial process in most States furnishes counsel to the indigent accused in criminal cases, but in civil cases, there is seldom such provision. Yet, the wrongs and rights in civil cases may be as vital to the citizen as those involved in criminal cases.

It is a pity that a small minority of lawyers participating in the legal services program has been guilty of questionable conduct. Unfortunately and unfairly, such conduct has cast a shadow over the entire legal services complex. Such conduct should be rebuked, especially when it approaches so close to the definition of barratry. It is the responsibility of the judiciary to discipline lawyers, who are officers of the court and accountable to it, for unprofessional conduct. It is the responsibility of those who administer the legal services program and their superiors in the Office of Economic Opportunity to maintain continuing oversight and impose appropriate corrective and preventive measures wherever and whenever necessary. Prevention can most effectively be achieved by inviting the advice and cooperation of authorities at State and community levels in the planning, organization and

functioning of the legal services apparatus.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity has little to show for the \$7 billion plus that it has expended during the past 5 years. An exorbitant price has been paid for any good that may have resulted.

A few months ago the General Accounting Office concluded a 1-year study of OEO and gave it very few plus marks. It found, for example, that the Job Corps, which has cost more than \$1 billion thus far, had not accounted for "any substantial economic benefit thus far for youths who participated in the program." The average cost of each Job Corps trainee was placed at \$8,300 per year.

The GAO said of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, designed to induce teenage students to remain in or return to classes:

The great majority of youths who have been enrolled in the NYC program . . . would probably have remained in or dropped out of school irrespective of their enrollment in the NYC program.

It cost the taxpayers a billion dollars.

The Headstart program has been one of the more popular and successful of OEO's projects. But the cost of each enrollee averaged \$1,100 a year, according to GAO, and that is considered to be exceedingly high.

The VISTA program has undoubtedly done more harm than good. It has used misfits and ill-prepared young people for jobs which required maturity and commonsense. In San Antonio, for example, the press reported that paid VISTA workers were active in organizing voter registration drives and in political activities. At the same place such workers participated in welfare demonstrations. The press has been replete with similar reports from all over the country. In Del Rio, Tex., they handed out hate literature and became so objectionable that city and county officials had to call on the Governor to help rid the city of their presence.

Many of the OEO programs have been absorbed by other Government agencies, where much or all of their work was duplicated anyhow. What is remaining, if continued, could undoubtedly be better administered by other agencies and by the States.

NEW RESTRICTIONS IMPERATIVE

Mr. Chairman, the law which created the Office of Economic Opportunity is so loosely drawn and so lacking in guidelines with respect to how the money is to be expended, that wholesale abuses have been reported. Perhaps never in American history has the Congress delegated so much authority to a government agency with respect to the spending of tax money. It has been a virtual blank-check operation, as everyone knows.

If the program is to be continued it is imperative that some controls and restrictions be written into the law. There is pending a proposed substitute which is designed to accomplish that objective. Under our federal system it is appropriate that the States have a voice in such expenditures. We know from experience that the job cannot be properly done at

the Washington level. Money is too hard to come by, taxes are too high, the burden of government is too great, for this program to be continued at its present excessive cost. The people are tired of seeing this display of waste and extravagance.

In a questionnaire I sent to all of my adult constituents 2 years ago I asked this question: "Do you believe the anti-poverty program has been worth the money?" the result: 6 percent said "yes" and 87 percent said "no."

Adoption of the pending substitute would apply some meaningful supervision over how and for what purposes all this money is spent.

WASTE AND MISUSE OF OEO FUNDS

There is no point in listing the scores and scores of instances of waste and inefficiency in the expenditure of OEO funds. Much of it has been of scandalous proportions. Money in vast amounts has been thrown around for every conceivable purpose, much of it only remotely if at all related to any rational use for anti-poverty purposes. Some of it remains unaccounted for.

Overhead and administrative costs of this program have been stupendous. In some instances exorbitant wages have been paid. In others the personnel load has been unbelievably excessive. In one Texas city, for example, the San Antonio Light reported:

Community action program records on the various poverty proponent projects show some 250 men and women are drawing good paychecks from Uncle Sam, from the executive director to last neighborhood aide.

The article continued:

CAP funds being paid directors, supervisors, coordinators, all sorts of assistants, counselors, bookkeepers, secretaries, clerks, aides and trainees run into the thousands of dollars.

That city had a population of some 60,000. I mention this as an example of what I mean when I speak of excessive overhead and administrative costs.

The U.S. News & World Report, after a survey, reported:

The five-year record (of OEO) bristles with examples of force and violence. . . . Repeatedly, there have been official charges of mismanagement, inefficiency, waste, fraud, graft, extravagance and lack of proper accounting in anti-poverty projects. . . . Critics have alleged that public funds have been misused by poverty workers in political campaigns and voter-registration drives, for union organizing, and in connection with racial disorders.

These charges are based upon hundreds of reliable reports.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors once charged that OEO was "creating tensions" among the poor and "fostering class struggle." A former mayor of San Francisco objected to an OEO Community Action Handbook which advocated "organizing low-income residents for political effectiveness."

As evidence of how the program has been bogged down in paperwork, surveys, evaluations, and what-have-you, the Washington Evening Star in its March 31, 1969, issue reported that in the last 5 years OEO had contracted for 818 evaluations, reports, studies, and surveys of

antipoverty activities, costing more than \$30 million. Lou Harris, the pollster, got nearly a million dollars for appraising a series of "job efforts" by the Job Corps.

Listen to this one: OEO announced a grant of \$272,443 to what was called Connecticut Law Reform, Inc., of Windsor, Conn., to "coordinate legal services to low-income families."

It turned out there was no such thing. The State commissioner, LeRoy Jones, whose department was supposed to know about all OEO grants there, had never heard of it. Finally, after a persistent search the mystery was solved. It turned out that the address of the newly created law reform corporation was the home address of an OEO legal services consultant. Apparently the lawyer who was to get the handout had dreamed up the "Law Reform, Inc.," title without bothering to incorporate.

This is by no means an isolated case of waste, if not corruption. It serves as an example of how vast amounts of tax money can be spent for anything the whims of the OEO might dictate. The present law is so loose and lacking in guidelines that it seems OEO can spend it for almost any purpose that suits their fancy. Many revolutionary movements have been benefited from OEO funds, including Pride in Washington, Rangers in Chicago, and Black Panthers in Cleveland and elsewhere.

There have been any number of instances where former OEO officials have resigned to join or create firms which then contracted with the OEO to perform one of the evaluations. What an invitation this program presents for favoritism and ill-considered and unnecessary surveys and studies of projects when in most instances Government agencies are already available to handle such assignments when they are necessary.

HOW MUCH POVERTY?

Mr. Chairman, every right-thinking American is sympathetic with those who are in need and who because of conditions beyond their control are unable to help themselves. That fact accounts for the interest in charity drives, support of the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and the generosity of many church organizations. Americans are compassionate people and throughout our history the unfortunate and the disadvantaged have been helped when the need was demonstrated.

As the subject of charity is pursued it is interesting to note the progress that has been made to reduce the incidence of poverty—progress which was being made in this country long before the war on poverty was ever heard of. There was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on last December 3 some pertinent Department of Commerce data on this subject. There it was revealed that, using 1964 constant dollars, 31 percent of the families in 1947 had incomes of less than \$3,000 and by 1964—when OEO was created—only 18 percent of the families fit into this category. This remarkable record was accomplished through normal economic growth which created new job opportunities, along with the co-operation of industry, Government, and private organizations.

From all the publicity given to the OEO one might think that this is about the only source of Federal aid designed to help the unfortunate. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Federal Government is now spending \$27 billion a year for the poor. In addition, the States and local governments pay out \$14 billion, and \$2.4 billion is contributed by voluntary private agencies.

Actually, the OEO spends only about 5 percent of the total amount that is spent to help poor people.

On December 3 the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon disclosed in the RECORD the results of a study conducted at her request by the Library of Congress. This referred to two hypothetical poor families, one being a mother and four children, and the other a mother and eight children—in each instance the children being placed in various school categories, believed to be in accord with averages.

In the first instance it was found that by taking advantage of all Government programs available, that family would be entitled to receive the equivalent of \$11,513 per year.

In the second instance, that family would be entitled to receive annually the equivalent of \$21,093.

Mr. Chairman, does this sound like the Federal Government is niggardly in dishing out welfare funds? Actually, such largess can, when excessive, tend to cause more people to prefer the good income and security offered by seeking a welfare-receiving status. In any event, such outlays should be restricted to the deserving and should not be made so readily available that it would help perpetuate dependence on Government as a way of life.

Some people seem to think you can cure any problem on the face of the earth if you spend enough Federal money. In fact, that concept has been predominant in recent years. But it does not work that way. Since jobs and birth control constitute the only real and meaningful answer to poverty, would it not be more desirable to dismantle the present grant programs, both in and out of OEO, and replace them with a voluntary and private enterprise plan which would encourage businesses to continue to train unemployed workers who are interested, and encourage more planned parenthood, particularly for the poor?

The fact is that poverty and hunger are being exploited by certain politicians and the poverty cult. The latter, who could be described as professional beggars, have been encouraged by all the ballyhoo to promote welfare as a way of life. They have organized in an effort to extract more from the earnings of the haves and give it to the have-nots. These people never talk of jobs; they talk only of welfare, and more of it.

Only recently at the White House Conference on Hunger, attended by more than 3,000, a resolution was adopted which called for a Government-guaranteed annual income of \$5,500 for every American family of four—whether they work or not. The cost? Those people could not care less. President Nixon, who disapproved the request, estimated the cost at \$75 billion a year.

While in certain circles it seems to be stylish these days to favor any expenditure if it is related to hunger and poverty, the time is long overdue to repudiate unreasonable and unrealistic demands. The pie-in-the-sky myth must be repulsed.

The least we can do in the House at this time is to adopt the pending substitute to the OEO bill. The next move should then be to screen all programs, transfer their functions to other agencies or to the States. In that way we would be better serving the best interests of American taxpayers and we would be pursuing the better course in the war on poverty.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the substitute to the administration OEO bill.

It is true that the early years of the poverty program were marred by inefficiency, fiscal waste, ineffective programs, and overlapping effort. But in recent years, we have seen some important improvement although further improvements are needed. VISTA, for example, has cut the cost of training a recruit from \$1,250 to \$850. Some ineffective programs have been weeded out, others combined, and still more transferred to other departments.

When President Nixon took office, many important initiatives were taken to improve the operation of this needed agency. His new Director, our former colleague Mr. Rumsfeld, is off to an impressive start in improving OEO's operations and programs. I feel that he deserves congressional backing to put his proposals into effect and I strongly oppose any substitute bill that would undermine his efforts to do so. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the position taken by the administration and vote no on the OEO substitute bill.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, to be poor is to die a little each day. I think those words would sum up succinctly the plight many Americans find themselves in today in this land of plenty. When former Presidents Kennedy and Johnson launched the broad sweeping program to eliminate poverty in America they wanted every community, every State and the Federal Government to participate in a joint effort. I am sorry to say that my State of Illinois, as an example, is spending very little money on the elimination of poverty per se; it is true that the State is building highways and some forms of public works that will have a lasting benefit on the poor. However, the State is doing very little if anything to provide financial assistance at the grassroots level where poverty does exist in our State. It is for this reason that we must continue to rely upon the Office of Economic Opportunity, a Federal program to provide the tools with which to help ourselves. It is for this reason and many others that I strongly oppose the substitute amendment that would take away from the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity the authority to work with local communities in stamping out poverty. If this substitute amendment is adopted any Governor of any State could put a halt to local programs. The cry has been made here for States

rights, but I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that we are now under the existing law going beyond States rights and giving this assistance to local communities. I think a local poverty director on the scene knows much more about what is needed than some Governor who may sit in a Governor's mansion 200 or 300 miles or more from the site of the poverty project. Let me give you a very good example of a case that just happened in my district last month. A young lady was abandoned by her husband, left with a 4-year-old child to care for with no income. The young mother was forced to place this child in a foster home with some distant relatives. After she secured employment she went to pick up the child and due to the attachment the distant relatives had built up for the child they would not let the natural mother have the child back. This young lady was forced to go to the local legal services bureau funded by the poverty program. The legal services lawyer immediately filed a writ in the court for the natural mother to obtain custody.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the reason this story is so pertinent to the debate today, it is ironic but true that just 2 days after this episode happened affecting the lives of these two poor people one of the high officials in that county announced that he was repudiating the entire poverty program in his county because he felt the program had not been of any value to the poor. It so happens that this official carries a lot of political weight and is a personal friend of the Governor. If the substitute amendment were in effect it is my sincere belief that the Governor more than 250 miles away from this incident would listen to this official and would eliminate that legal services, plus other poverty programs in the area that have worked and worked well.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to run the risk of eliminating these poverty programs for political expediency. The case I have alluded to, and many others in similar circumstances both for legal services and other programs administered by OEO would certainly be in jeopardy.

Mr. Chairman, much of the antipoverty money goes to the city, and many Governors and State legislatures have displayed a lackadaisical attitude toward the problems of the city. One big city mayor for example concluded there is an almost total lack of interest, lack of help on the part of the State. The Federal Government has been much more oriented toward solving the real problems that exist in this country both in rural and urban areas.

Therefore, I cannot understand any urban area Congressman, Republican or Democrat, voting for the substitute amendment. President Nixon has said he supports our friend and former colleague, Donald Rumsfeld, head of OEO. If he does, Mr. Chairman, then why not ask his own Republican colleagues in the House to support his own program and his own administrator. Next November we will hear the cry from the President, "I need a Republican Congress." Here is a good example of how a majority of the Democrats are supporting Mr. Rumsfeld

and the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Nixon program and where a majority of the Republicans in Congress are against the President and his own OEO program. Our distinguished friend and colleague, the very able chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. CARL PERKINS, of Kentucky, recently called the substitute plan a "fraud upon the American poor" and stated that the plan will pass unless President Nixon steps in. I am constrained to agree with my friend Mr. PERKINS and hope the President will step in and that we can save this program for the poor people of southern Illinois and the country. I certainly will be doing my part to support the President and his program administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity and I hope my colleagues will reject the substitute amendment and will support the committee and help extend OEO for 2 more years.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Education and Labor for its fine work in extending the Economic Opportunity Act for 2 years, with an authorization of \$2,343 billion. I heartily endorse the committee's decision to perpetuate and increase the funds for such important programs as Headstart and Follow Through, Mainstream and New Careers, and emergency food and medical services. I also support the solicitude that the committee has shown for the elderly in various provisions of this legislation.

I would be less than candid, however, if I did not also add that conditions in our country justify a much greater financing of this legislation. I say this not in criticism of the committee, for I understand the handicap under which it has operated. We are living in inflationary times, under an economy-minded administration. But we are also living in times of social distress, and in my view the programs operating under the Economic Opportunity Act have demonstrated their merit in the years since their inception.

For this reason, I am unhappy that some Members on my own side of the aisle want to compromise with expediency by turning over all of the poverty program to the control of the States. We have had enough experience to know that there is no surer way to do in the war on poverty, lock, stock, and barrel. This is a time for a renewal of effort, not a retrenchment.

In fact, we are still fighting a skirmish against poverty, not the war we were promised when President Johnson proposed this legislation. The war we are fighting is abroad, where it should not be. We are still assigning false priorities to the work which must be done to repair the breaches in our society. The Office of Economic Opportunity has shown its worth, and it should be supported with an increasing financial commitment by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the Green-Quie amendment, and I will vote against it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12321, which would extend the Economic Opportunity Act for 2 years.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, established in 1964, has done much to bring the poor and less fortunate into the mainstream of American society. It has provided jobs, training, and most of all, hope, to the poverty population. It is not an illusory hope, as many claim; it is a hope based on the efforts and the commitment of the many Americans who feel that poverty is not a "fact of life," and that poverty can be eliminated.

Should the programs of the OEO be placed under State control, their truly local character would be swept away. I, too, favor the local character of the program and participation on a local level.

In the past, we have found that in some States, cities have met resistance at the State level in meeting problems which are totally unique to the urban area. For this reason, a great many city officials have requested direct grants from Washington almost totally bypassing the State government. Should we expect the State governments suddenly to be sympathetic to the problems of urban areas?

If we urge local control, let us leave the structure of OEO programs as they are. Let us keep the poverty programs above the political whims of the State government. Let us keep poverty from becoming a political football and direct our attentions toward aiding the poor with jobs, training, and education.

To those who advocate State control of the legal services program, I ask, should the poor resolve their conflicts in the street? Or should they use the courts? The answer is obvious. If a Governor is allowed to veto certain cases, the poor in our society will not have the access to the courts that all citizens in our society need.

I concur with the American Bar Association that a Governor's veto "will impair the ability of legal services programs to respond to the needs of the poor and constitute oppressive interference with the freedom of the lawyers and the citizen."

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the VISTA volunteer has more to offer than just a willingness to help the poor. Over the past 2 years, VISTA has concentrated on recruiting men and women with professional skills. Today, three out of four applicants selected for VISTA service have college degrees. A significant number are graduate business students, architects, planners, health specialists, teachers, and lawyers. Presently, more than one out of every nine VISTA volunteers is an attorney.

Six hundred VISTA lawyers are now serving all over the country, most of them under the sponsorship of legal services programs. They are supervised by staff lawyers of neighborhood legal service offices and other practicing attorneys in their areas. VISTA lawyers act as house counsel for large community groups who cannot afford to pay for professional assistance. Their services are unique.

For example, a year ago last September, New York University Law School enrolled 27 young VISTA lawyers in a 20-month masters degree program in urban affairs and poverty law, funded by

the Office of Economic Opportunity's legal services. The students combine academic studies with legal field work in the poverty areas of New York City. They spread out into Brooklyn, into Harlem, the Bronx, and poor neighborhoods in Manhattan—each specializing in specific areas of poverty law, landlord-tenant problems, employment and education problems, health protection, consumer protection—whatever problem is most pressing in the communities where the VISTA lawyers live and work.

Stan Kesselman is an example of a VISTA lawyer at work. A 26-year-old graduate of Fordham Law School, and a member of the New York bar, he works on complaints from low-income consumers in Harlem. He has taken care of many through direct action with the offending firm. He handled a freezer fraud case which was settled out of court on behalf of 10 victims.

Last spring, Kesselman helped organize the Harlem Consumer Protection Union to offer free legal advice, counsel, and education. He helped to develop a legal structure for the group, write proposals to foundations, and obtained financial aid from various funding sources. Then, a couple of months ago, he helped set up another consumer protection program in the Bronx.

VISTA lawyer Louis Lanier recently discovered that a plan for vest pocket housing in Brooklyn called for the razing of all the buildings in eight blocks at one time. There were no relocation plans for 900 low-income families living in the buildings. Lanier worked with city planners and an architect on another plan asking for staged construction. This meant that only 50 families would have to move out initially. The other 850 would move into new units as they were built. The VISTA lawyer wrote up the plan in a proposal presented by tenant leaders at a city planning commission hearing. The result: housing authorities were requested to conduct relocation studies in the area. The abrupt displacement of 900 families was stopped.

Another VISTA attorney, Arnold Bothbaum, helped prevent what might have been a major student revolt in a Brooklyn high school. By working with student leaders day after day he was able to direct their discontent into constructive action. The students settled many of their differences with teachers and school administrators in a conference instead of a confrontation.

Today there are 53 young law graduates enrolled in the VISTA-New York University Law School program. Double the number who started last year. Some are members of the New York bar. Those who are not, work closely under the supervision of practicing New York attorneys.

The substitute OEO bill would not only slow up and drastically impair the progress of this program in poverty law, it would virtually destroy VISTA legal projects in States with few law schools to recruit volunteers. More than 430 young men and women from my own State of Connecticut have served as VISTA volunteers of which 112 are currently serving in all parts of the coun-

try. Of this number approximately 50 are serving in Connecticut in 14 projects. This substitute OEO bill—Quie-Green amendment—requires that all VISTA volunteers be native to the State in which they serve. If this requirement were made law the Nation would lose the services of more than 60 Connecticut volunteers who are presently active where they are most needed in other parts of the country. Of the 14 attorneys to volunteer from Connecticut, only three have been retained in the State, thus providing 11 skilled professionals for employment in areas where the need for their services is greater proportionate to the number of volunteers so equipped. It was not the intent of the original VISTA act to force regions with the greatest need to draw upon their limited supply of professionally qualified people. This amendment would cause this situation to develop and in doing so would likely end the effectiveness of the entire volunteer lawyer program.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the substitute.

I do not take this position because of a belief that the administration of the poverty program has been flawless. From personal experience as well as from the studies of the Special Studies Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations which I chair, I have become only too familiar with the deficiencies in this program.

The special study which our subcommittee made of the administration of the medical care program in Bellaire, Ohio, which was published in July constitutes a striking example of the managerial, fiscal, legal, and policy failures of one facet of this program in one particular town.

Needless to say, there have been other more glaring and more culpable examples of maladministration.

My objection to this motion, however, is based on the belief that no substantial benefit in administration would be gained by shifting the program to the States while the potential improvements of an effective national administration probably would be lost.

I see nothing to indicate that the programs which are covered by this legislation would have improved management in my own State and in fact the Administrator of the Department of Community Affairs who presumably would have charge of any State program has specifically requested that the substitute be defeated.

At the same time, there have been some administrative improvements in OEO in recent months and one can believe that further improvements could be effected under the pressure of congressional control and close scrutiny.

I do want to make clear that in criticizing the program I do not indicate that it has been entirely ineffective. There are many helpful and constructive programs included under OEO and these programs such as the foster grandparents program, Headstart, vocational training, and others should be continued.

In short, I believe that retaining Federal control with an improved policy of centralized administration would have

better results for the country than splitting it up and setting up 50 different organizations and 50 different policies of operation.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago Congress heard the voice of another America—an America inhabited by 35 million poor, who lived without hope and without opportunity. In response, the House passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It offered no instant miracles, no easy remedies, not even any assurance of clear-cut success. But it did do one thing—it offered what its very name says—opportunity.

With poverty still a disgrace amidst this country's affluence, the Ayres substitute bill would retract even that offer. It would turn over to the States the anti-poverty program, and thereby would begin an antipoor program.

No clear-cut victories have yet been won by that silent and powerless minority of 35 million. Nor have easy answers been found. Mistakes have been made and will continue to be made, whether OEO survives or whether the poverty program is turned over to the States. This must be so, for the problems of poverty and hopelessness and lack of opportunity have confounded America for 300 years; no indictment can be sustained against OEO for not solving them in 5.

But certainly one momentous, yet subtle, change has been wrought in the last 5 years. The poor have found their voice; and they have found that some, at least, are willing to hear it.

It is too late now to resurrect the past. And it is too easy now, should this House pass the substitute to imperil the future.

The Economic Opportunity Act sought to involve the poor in determining and shaping their own destiny. It created the Office of Economic Opportunity as the only agency in the Federal Government which speaks for the poor and with the poor. Central to the poverty program is the concept of community action—the idea that people of a community, working together, can together serve their common interests and solve their common problems.

Despite the 1967 amendment to the act, which enabled local political bodies to designate themselves or others as community action agencies and thus to bring local political pressure to the fore, participation of the poor has remained the integral and vital basic premise: at least one-third of the membership of a community action agency governing board must be representatives of the poor.

The substitute guts OEO. If it is enacted, the OEO Director will be a mere figurehead: a conduit for money to the States with little supervisory authority and very doubtful authority to override a State's denial of a funding request by a local agency.

The substitute stills the voice of the poor. It turns over the Federal anti-poverty program to the statehouse. It denies the local community action agency an effective right if its application for funding is rejected. It strengthens the hands of local politicians, for section 301 amends the present act's section 211 to require that public officials not only make up one-third of the community action

agency board, but in addition, they are to appoint at least 25 percent of the remainder of the board.

Thus the substitute bill stifles the emerging, and essential, power of the poor by surrendering the anti-poverty program to State and local politics. The bill inhibits the advocates of the poor—the legal service lawyers. And the bill turns over control of the allies of the poor—VISTA volunteers—to the States.

Section 250 of the substitute bill seeks "positive involvement" of the States "in the development, carrying out, and coordination of anti-poverty programs within each State." It has been suggested that a State may opt out, that it need not exercise its authority to become positively involved. Certainly the bald truth is clear. No State is going to forgo the chance to increase power and control over those who would challenge the conventional wisdom that political power follows economic power.

Make no mistake. "Positive involvement" of the States means an attack on the poor and the powerless, on the Harlem black, and the Appalachian miner, and the forgotten Indian.

Section 251(a) of the substitute directs the OEO Director to fund the State economic opportunity offices, which are to serve as the conduits for applications for assistance made under title II—community action—and title VIII—VISTA. It further requires that each State economic opportunity office may comment on any proposed program or activity under every title of the Economic Opportunity Act. For the State office is to play "an affirmative role" in the poverty program, and most particularly in the community action and VISTA programs.

Whose benefit does this "affirmative role" serve? Certainly the past is prolog to the future, and surely the past is grim. The black ghettos of Harlem attest to the failure of affirmative action by Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and other States. The slums of Chicago's uptown bear witness to the lack of affirmative action by the Appalachian States.

The "affirmative role" played by the States since passage of the Economic Opportunity Act also teaches us a lesson. The present act provides in section 242 that a Governor may veto a community action grant, contract, or loan, although his veto may be overridden by the OEO Director. In 5 years, 70 Governor's vetoes have been registered. Of these, two-thirds—47—have been registered by only one-seventh of the States. Of these seven states, six are Southern—Alabama, 13; Florida, three; Louisiana, four; Mississippi, nine; South Carolina, one; and Texas, two. And the seventh State, California, did not register its 15 vetoes until the administration of a strongly conservative Governor.

It has been said that the so-called progressive State should not be prevented from playing an affirmative role because of the failures of the so-called regressive State. The truth is that no State is progressive in fighting poverty. No State has not failed. Every State should do more—it must do more.

But the Federal Government also must do more. It cannot do less. Poverty is a national problem—the poor black farmer

of Mississippi is our spiritual brother and our economic responsibility. And the duty to help is a national one, and must be met by a viable national program.

Section 251 of the Ayres substitute bill solidifies the power of the States to pursue their own ends by whittling the OEO Director's power to override a Governor's veto down to form without substance. Under the present act, the Director may override a Governor's disapproval of a community action grant if he finds the grant to be consistent with the act and in furtherance of title II's purposes. But under the substitute proposal the Director would have the onerous burden of establishing that the State office's rejection of a local agency's application for funding "would seriously weaken the overall program of a community action agency." Certainly, the Federal Government's voice under the substitute is to be a hollow one.

Section 253(a) of the substitute is the keystone of the surrender to the States, and the key to the stifling of the poor. The section authorizes the State economic opportunity officer to seek from the Director designation as the "sole agency for administration of the State program, or for supervision of the administration thereof by community action agencies." Thereby, the Mississippi State house becomes minister to the needs of the delta farmer. And thereby disappears this man's chance for change.

This same section takes no half measures; for it also deprives local agencies of an effective right to appeal the State office's rejection of their applications for funding. The substitute provides "that any community action agency, or other public or private agency which is a qualified applicant for program assistance under this title, dissatisfied with a final action with respect to any application for funds under this title shall be given reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing by the State office." Thus, the same State office, which may be the "sole agency for administration of the State program," is the arbiter of the applicant it has already rejected.

What has happened to the override power of section 251? It is largely meaningless—it cripples the OEO Director's authority by giving him an override only when he finds that "disapproval of such application would seriously weaken the overall program plan of a community action agency." But even this, section 253 seems to take away; if a State becomes the sole administering agency, I interpret section 253(a) (7) as cutting off the local agency's right of appeal to OEO.

Nor does section 604 of the present act appear to redeem this right. Section 604 authorizes the OEO Director to hear appeals from delegate agencies which have been rejected by the prime sponsor or community action agency. But the substitute proposes to supplant the Director by making the State office "the sole agency for administration of the State program."

Mr. Chairman, the Ayres substitute bill not only stifles the voice of the poor, themselves, by surrendering OEO's authority to State politics, and by turning over control of community action agencies to local politicians. It also severely

inhibits the legal services attorneys who are their advocates.

The substitute bill places the legal services program under the control of the States: as with community action agencies, the State economic opportunity office will be empowered to reject an application for funding. Thus, every legal service lawyer will have to ask himself at every crucial juncture whether the political fallout from his actions will destroy his program.

By what double standard do we attack those who seek redress of their grievances in the streets and seek to stifle those who embrace the courts?

If some attack the legal services program, they do so because of its successes, not its failures. They attack because the Governor of California was barred by the courts from making cuts in the State's Medicaid program as the result of a legal services suit, and because the poor have won the right to counsel in the municipal courts of Oregon.

But it is the courts which ruled. It is the courts which acted. Lawyers do not make law. They represent clients. It is the courts, then, which are really being indicted here. Let us be forthright about what we do. Let us not penalize the poor by stifling their advocates, just because we do not like what the courts have done.

And by what double standard does the substitute bill require VISTA lawyers to be admitted to the bar of the State to which they are assigned, while the attorneys of the affluent may appear throughout the land merely by obtaining the very superficial supervision of local counsel?

This bar admission requirement would probably not harm New York or Illinois or California, for these States produce many attorneys who join the VISTA program. But few, if any, VISTA attorneys would be members of the bar in some States. Nor is it easy to say that VISTA volunteers can readily gain admission to the local bar. In many States, they would have to pass the State bar examination, which requires months of preparation in learning the peculiarities of local law—peculiarities seldom, if ever, relevant to VISTA volunteers' practice. And following the examination are months in waiting for the results and more months until formal admission.

Perhaps even more egregious, attorneys who seek to advocate the rights of the poor and the disadvantaged would have to pass the scrutiny of State "character" committees, a task not easily accomplished if the "character" committee is composed of a group of middle-aged successful lawyers wedded to the status quo.

The substitute bill's scope is not limited only to VISTA attorneys. The bill brings the power of the State house to bear against all VISTA volunteers, for it turns the program over to the States by giving them the power to recruit, train, assign VISTA volunteers under grants from the OEO Director.

I ask, when a VISTA volunteer stands by the side of the poor, who are seeking to change the system so that they may take their rightful place within it, how can that VISTA volunteer owe his allegiance—his very assignment—to the

State house, which has so seldom responded to the voice of the poor? It takes no strained imagination to foresee that few idealistic youths are going to volunteer for VISTA when they will be held responsible to Lester Maddox's State economic opportunity office.

And what has happened to the calls for economy which we usually hear from the sponsors of the substitute? To fragment a national program into 50 parts is to multiply expense and overhead. In fact, this entire bill calls for more money for administration and less for the people. Fifty States administering 50 separate programs means more staff, more paperwork, more confusion. And so the poor lose again.

Finally, the substitute bill would even stifle those who are in the most superficial way allied with the poor. The bill proposes to limit the political activities of any "person who, directly or indirectly, received from funds appropriated under the authority of this act an amount which exceeds one-quarter of the total amount such person regularly receives in salary payments, or in consultant fees."

Thereby, employees of Thiokol Corp., which operates the Clearfield Job Corps Center in Utah, are barred from seeking partisan political office and from partisan campaigning. So too is the janitor who sweeps the floors at the Martin Luther King Community Health Center in Chicago, and the doctor who serves the poor there.

Mr. Chairman, poverty is a disgrace in our land—a disgrace which festers in our national conscience and which taints our national dignity. It is the guilt of the affluent and the burden of the poor. Yet by some tragic contortion, the substitute bill would transmute the ills and hopelessness of our poor into their blame and their shame. It would perversely punish those who have believed us when we said to them: "Stay within the system; seek your rights within it; your stake is as big in it as is ours."

There is one portion of the substitute bill which I note with very special interest. The bill proposes that the OEO Director shall conduct projects to raise the income levels of Armed Forces families, when such families reside in the United States and through exceptional circumstances have an income level below the poverty line. Further, the director is to conduct pilot projects to raise the income levels of persons 65 and over above the poverty level.

There is no reason to limit this assistance to apply only if, "through exceptional circumstances," they have an income level below the poverty line. Nor is there much to be learned from more pilot projects. OEO is already funding a negative income tax experiment among the rural poor which includes within the experimental group aged persons.

The time for half steps and for more experiments and pilot projects is past. As I proposed in my Income Maintenance Act, which I first introduced in May of 1968, and which I reintroduced in the same form in the 91st Congress as H.R. 586 and in revised form as H.R. 14773, the time is now for the House to enact a

minimum income guarantee for everyone.

The administration has requested a 2-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. The House committee has reported out a bill making few changes. It expands the new careers and mainstream program; it adds a title which provides special comprehensive preschool programs and programs to provide for intensive followthrough education for primary school children; and it adds a new title which provides assistance for intensive programs to eliminate hunger and malnutrition.

I support the bill reported out by the committee. I would like to see more. I am not happy when the House appropriates \$70 billion for the military and only \$2.34 billion to fight poverty. I was not happy about the closing of 59 Job Corps centers. Certainly we cannot allow the antipoverty program to be further undermined by adopting the Ayres substitute.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I vigorously oppose the amendment to grant Governors the right to veto legal services projects.

Proponents of this amendment have a very restrictive view of the role of legal services. Legal aid societies have a responsibility to represent the interests of the poor in the same manner that lawyers traditionally represent the interests of free-generating clients.

Frequently, the poor have legal problems involving the Government. When wealthy clients are confronted with governmental action that they wish to challenge legally, there is no bar on instituting a case against the Government in the appropriate forum. Under the proposed amendment, the case filed by the lawyer for a poor client would be subject to veto based upon political consideration. The amendment would offer only an inferior grade of legal relief to the poor. Conscientious legal representation of the poor necessitates more than routine legal representation for persons who cannot afford to pay fees.

It is through conscientious legal representation of clients that neighborhood legal services has become a vital force in bettering the plight of the poor. Innovative legal services projects have resulted in development of poverty law. A clarification of judicial interpretation of a specific law can benefit thousands of persons. It is through the politically volatile cases that law is made.

Landmark cases filed by the Legal Aid Society of Cleveland on behalf of indigent clients could have been prevented under this amendment. For instance, Cleveland Legal Aid Society lawyers were successful in an action against the Ohio Department of Public Welfare challenging the Ohio 1-year residency requirement for receipt of public assistance. In another case, Cleveland legal aid lawyers were victorious in challenging the city's method of structuring the Cleveland model cities program. There are several cases presently pending before Federal courts in Ohio, which would first, test the discrepancy in payments between aid to families with dependent children and other categorical assistance programs; second, challenge the Ohio public welfare stepfather rule; third,

challenge Ohio's regulation regarding the use of social security benefits specifically designated for a particular child; and, fourth, challenge the method by which the board of education solicits united appeal funds from poor school-children.

Each of those cases would be subject to the veto of the Governor under the proposed amendment. A favorable decree in the mentioned cases would improve the plight of the poor in Ohio.

If governmental officials are of the belief that a legal challenge of a particular law is unfounded, the appropriate forum to resolve the dispute is the courts, not the political arena. If the validity of a law cannot be substantiated in the crucible of the judicial process, the law is questionable. The poor must not be deprived of this opportunity to challenge a questionable law.

It would be a tragedy to limit the legal representation of the poor at a time when inroads into solving the problems of the poor have begun.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, over the past week there has been some confusion as to where the White House stood on the so-called State plan substitute to the poverty bill. Some have stated that the President is not opposed to the substitute bill despite the OEO Director's repeated assertions that the substitute was an unacceptable crippling amendment and that he spoke for the administration.

Monday night, President Nixon made known his position in response to a question at his press conference. The President said, and I quote:

I support the director of OEO. He has asked for a two-year extension. He has pledged to reform the OEO, and I think he should be given the chance to reform it.

The President went on to express the hope that some accommodation could be reached between the OEO Director and those proposing amendments. Mr. Chairman, I want to echo that hope and indicate that I think there are some portions of the substitute that would be acceptable and noncrippling. But the President has made explicit his opposition to any crippling amendments. In his October 11 message to Congress, President Nixon said:

I have provided the Office of Economic Opportunity with a new director, a new structure, and added responsibilities as the research and development arm of the nation's effort to deal with the problems of the poor. . . . I have asked for a two-year extension of the existing legislation, without crippling amendments. I believe that a reformed OEO has a major and continuing role to play in our national life.

OEO Director Don Rumsfeld, our former colleague, has indicated that the heart of the substitute would clearly cripple the agency and "very likely would prove to be a nightmare to administer." It would radically alter the innovative research and development function of the agency by shifting the major program responsibilities to the States. I think the States should be given larger responsibilities in OEO planning, programming and evaluation. But I do not think the substitute bill offers a proper approach to this. Director Don Rumsfeld

has pledged himself to implementing the provisions of the 1967 amendments which call for a wider State role; under the previous administration these amendments were ignored by the OEO. Don Rumsfeld has revised the OEO guidelines to provide for a stronger State voice in OEO programs. I think he is to be commended for this and I agree with the President that "he should be given the chance to reform it." To radically alter the agency at this time would be an unwarranted vote of no confidence in the new Director and the new directions he has charted for the agency. Let us give him a chance.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD I wish to include a letter which I received from Don Rumsfeld in my capacity as chairman of the House Republican conference, and a transcript of the Director's recent appearance on the CBS television program, "Face the Nation," last Sunday, December 7.

The materials follow:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D. C., December 2, 1969.

HON. JOHN ANDERSON,
Chairman, Republican Conference, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The proposed substitute to the Economic Opportunity Act, to my knowledge, is still not available in final form. Unfortunately, this means that there has not been time for the Nixon Administration to study it and comment precisely on its potential impact. Also, it might be added that it will be equally difficult for Members of the House to study it and know with any precision what its effect might be. However, from what I know of the substitute, it seems clear that if passed it would substantially reduce the value of the reorganized and redirected Office of Economic Opportunity.

Some form of "state plan" approach is no doubt valid for certain kinds of federal programs. I have voted for some in the past. Also, the President has proposed a State approach in the Manpower Training Act for close to one-half of the Economic Opportunity Act funds. He specifically did not recommend this for the remaining activities of the Agency. The reason was that such an approach is not valid or sensible for many of the remaining activities to be conducted by this Agency.

I believe that in the past, the states have not been included in Office of Economic Opportunity planning and operations to the extent that they should have been. In the few months I have been Director several important and specific steps have been initiated to remedy this situation. Attached is a brief summary of those steps.

In my judgment, the proposed substitute would cripple the new role for the Office of Economic Opportunity. It would destroy the research, program development and evaluation function, be as damaging to the Legal Services program as the Senate-passed Amendment and very likely would prove to be a nightmare to administer.

On several occasions, the President has asked that the bill be extended without crippling amendments. This is clearly a crippling amendment. I have testified before the Congress opposing such a State plan. The President and I have both asked to be given a reasonable period of time to improve the activities of the Agency. I understand that this is a difficult vote for many members. However, a sufficient number of Republican votes are needed if we are to defeat the Waggonner-Gialmo-Green Amendment.

Sincerely,

DONALD RUMSFELD,
Director.

THE NEW OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—
OEO

Under the new Administration, OEO has a new focus and operates many different programs from those originally conceived in the 1964 legislation.

The Fiscal Year 1970 budget request for OEO is \$2.048 billion. Of that amount \$1.273 billion will be transferred to other agencies to fund delegated programs administered by those agencies; \$775 million of the \$2.048 will be used to fund programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Office of Economic Opportunity Administered
Programs

	Million
Community action operations (local initiative, training and technical assistance, State economic opportunity offices, program direction and Senior opportunity services) ..	\$393.4
Legal programs	54.0
Health programs (comprehensive health services; emergency food and medical services; family planning)	127.0
Migrants	33.0
Research and pilot programs	114.6
VISTA	37.0
General direction	16.0
Total	775.0

Delegated Programs

	Million
Department of Labor (Job Corps; Neighborhood Youth Corps; concentrated employment program; job opportunities in the business sector; public service careers/new careers; Operation Mainstream) ..	\$871.3
Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Headstart; Headstart Follow Through)	389.7
Department of Agriculture (Rural loans)	12.0
Total	1,273

REDIRECTION OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC
OPPORTUNITY

Organizational changes

Delegated Job Corps Program to the Department of Labor on July 1, 1969.

Delegated the Head Start Program to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare on July 1, 1969.

Transferred the Foster Grandparents Program to the Administration on Aging.

Executed this Administration's first complete reorganization of any major federal agency.

Establishing new regional offices in Boston, Denver, and Seattle.

Relationship with the States

Drafted new guidelines providing for a stronger state voice in OEO programs.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is strengthening the state economic opportunity offices so that they may:

Jointly develop with the Office of Economic Opportunity state funding plans for the expenditure of the Office of Economic Opportunity funds.

Better assist the Office of Economic Opportunity grantees in the planning and development of their applications for funding, and the Office of Economic Opportunity in its review of these applications.

Participate with the Office of Economic Opportunity in the evaluation of the Office of Economic Opportunity-funded programs within their state.

Community action operations

Refused to refund a number of Community Action Agencies and local delegate agencies because of poor performance.

Instituted a review of all Community Action Agencies to evaluate their effectiveness. Prepared in draft form regulations which

prohibit the hiring, with federal funds, of persons with recent convictions of serious crimes for certain sensitive positions.

Issued regulations to speed up grant processing time.

Procurement practices and conflict of interest

Prepared in draft form regulations and policy instructions to tighten up procurement practices. These regulations would:

Place controls over contracting with organizations in which former OEO employees hold senior positions.

Limit procurements which are made without competition and increase the number of awards to small business.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S STATEMENTS ON THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

On February 19th, President Nixon sent to Congress a message on the anti-poverty programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity in which he called for a one-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. The following are excerpts from that message:

"The blight of poverty requires priority attention. It engages our hearts and challenges our intelligence. It cannot and will not be treated lightly or indifferently, or without the most searching examination of how best to marshal the resources available to the Federal Government for combating it."

"In making these changes, I recognize that innovation costs money—and that if OEO is to continue its effectiveness as an innovating agency, adequate funds must be made available on a continuing basis. It is also my intent that the vital Community Action Programs will be pressed forward."

On June 2nd President Nixon issued a statement in which he requested a two-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act:

"I will request an extension of the authorization for OEO appropriations from June 30, 1969 to June 30, 1971; and I will ask that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 be extended from June 30, 1970 to June 30, 1972."

"A two-year extension would provide a better framework within which the necessary improvements in the anti-poverty program can be made."

"If we are to make lasting significant headway against poverty, there still is a great deal to be learned about what works and what does not. This Administration is committed to search for that knowledge, and to use it. We are committed to the continuation of an agency whose special concern is the poor; and we are determined to make the Nation's anti-poverty efforts function more efficiently and serve the poor more effectively."

On August 11 the President issued a statement on the reorganization of the Office of Economic Opportunity:

"I believe that the goal of full economic opportunity for every American can be realized. I expect the Office of Economic Opportunity to play a central role in that achievement. With new organizational structures, new operating procedures, and a new sense of precision and direction, OEO can be one of the most creative and productive offices in the government. For here much of our social pioneering will be done. Here will begin many of our new adventures."

On October 11 President Nixon sent to the Congress a message on several legislative issues. One part of that message deals with reform of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Concerning OEO reform, the President stated:

"I have provided the Office of Economic Opportunity with a new director, a new structure, and added responsibilities as the research and development arm of the nation's effort to deal with the problems of the poor. . . . I have asked for a two-year extension of the existing legislation, without crippling amendments. I believe that a reformed OEO has a major and continuing role to play in our national life."

FACE THE NATION

(As broadcast over the CBS television network and the CBS radio network, Dec. 7, 1969)

Guest: Donald R. Rumsfeld, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Reporters: George Herman, CBS News; Martin Nolan, Boston Globe; David Schoumacher, CBS News.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Rumsfeld, House Republicans are backing an amendment which you have said would make your job an absolute nightmare, but Republican Leader Gerry Ford seems to feel that the President will settle for the amendments. Do you have any new word from the President that he plans new action to oppose them?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, I discussed the legislation at some length with the President on Friday, and there is no question in my mind but that the President supports my position. And it is my hope that we can have the House very quickly pass legislation dealing with the Office of Economic Opportunity so that we can get on with our job.

ANNOUNCER. From CBS Washington, in color, FACE THE NATION, a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Donald Rumsfeld. Mr. Rumsfeld will be questioned by CBS News Correspondent David Schoumacher, Martin Nolan, of the Washington Bureau of the Boston Globe, and CBS News Correspondent George Herman. We shall continue the interview with Mr. Rumsfeld in a moment.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Rumsfeld, I can understand that you want the extension of the OEO passed, but do you want it passed with these amendments? Is that what the President and you are favoring?

Mr. RUMSFELD. No, indeed. I have stated categorically that I think that the substitute that has been proposed within the last 48 hours is not desirable and it is my hope that the two-year extension will be passed without amendments of that nature. The reason for this—this is the President's position also—the reason for this is that we have an agency that has been designed to function in a way which would enable it to embark on research, evaluation, the development of new programs, and to force the activities of that agency into a mold that would very closely approximate a state plan or a normal governmental approach which I think is undesirable and unwise.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Rumsfeld, when you were in the House you were always identified with the liberal wing of the Republican Party. You are a very good friend of Senator Goodell, of New York, who has been critical of just about everything Mr. Nixon does, and now you find yourself being opposed by Congressman Ford, who is the Republican floor leader. Which way do you think the Republican Party is headed in domestic legislation? Is it toward Senator Goodell's idea of things or toward Congressman Ford's?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would think that, trying to read motion of the Republican Party into any debate on the Economic Opportunity Act really wouldn't be a very good idea, for this reason: Historically, this agency has been a very controversial one in the Congress. You can recall that it was created amid a very partisan atmosphere, back in 1964, and it has been subject to a great deal of criticism over a period of five years. The Republicans in the House who, of course, I have served with and are good friends of mine, have had a position, a good many of them, of opposition to the agency as it was being operated. It is understandable to me that the members of the House would reflect some of the criticisms we've seen across the country. I understand that. The fact remains that I think that it is desirable for this country to have an agency that has as its concern the problems of the poor. I think it is desirable that that agency—which is not a big agency, it is

not a massive war on poverty, as has been said over the years, it is a small office in the Executive Office of the President. Its budget is \$2 billion, out of a budget of \$192 billion. All agencies of government are involved in the problems of the poor and so, too, the state and local government. But my point is that I think that this country is big enough and wise enough to allocate some \$775 million, which is essentially what is involved in this amendment, for the purpose of seeing if we as a society can make our institutions function as better problem-solving mechanisms. I don't think it is desirable to impose a mold on the activities of this office that is similar to the mold that functions with respect to so many other government programs. I think that we need better ideas. We need better solutions than we have.

Mr. SCHOUMACHER. Mr. Rumsfeld, there are, of course, people on the Hill that would disagree with your view of what the substitute would do in the Economic Opportunity field, but before I go into that I have a sort of a political question: Throughout the campaign, the President, in fact, called OEO a failure, the poverty program. The newspapers have been full of abuses that have been committed in this program. Many Congressmen, Republican Congressmen as well as Democrats, campaigned against this program last time. I can't understand what made you think that, in view of this background, Congress was going to be willing to accept a program identical with what has gone on in the past. How could you come before the Congress and say "Give us two more years of the same thing, with a little extra money"?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, I didn't, as a practical matter. The point I made, when I testified before both the House and the Senate, and the point the President made while I was still in Congress, before I ever left the Congress to come to the Office of Economic Opportunity, was that there were a variety of changes that he, the President, had made before I came in, such as the delegation of Headstart, the delegation of the Job Corps. There were a variety of changes that I have made subsequent to my becoming Director. We have completely reorganized the agency. We have redrafted, rewritten a great many of the procedures and guidelines, its relationships with states and local governments. We are in the process of fulfilling the President's mandate, to see that this agency becomes the innovative arm of the federal government. So there have been a substantial number of changes. There is an additional change that has been put forward. Out of the \$2 billion in the Office of Economic Opportunity legislation, the President has proposed the Manpower Training Act, which would take about \$900 million, and place them in the Department of Labor, where they are presently administered, although funded in our Act, and then develop a better involvement of the states for those parts of the program. But he specifically said—and I have specifically said—that the remainder of the funds in the Economic Opportunity Act, roughly the \$775 million I am referring to, should not be placed down to a different level of government or handled in a different way.

Mr. SCHOUMACHER. But most of these things you're saying are regulations that you yourself have instituted, that may or may not work under you or someone in the future.

Mr. RUMSFELD. No, some of—

Mr. SCHOUMACHER. I mean streamlining the efficiency. Wouldn't you, if you were on the Hill, insist that there be some changes in the law?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, that is what I was just saying. There have been changes. The President has proposed the Manpower Training Act. He has already delegated Headstart and the Job Corps, prior to my even coming into the agency. There have been changes involving about three—three substantial changes,

some legislative and some not—involving about three-quarters of the agency's activities, about \$1.2 billion out of \$2 billion.

Mr. SCHOUMACHER. The controversy, of course, involves the Community Action, I mean much of the controversy—

Mr. RUMSFELD. This is true.

Mr. SCHOUMACHER. Surrounds the Community Action Agencies, and in that area there is no change in the law that you have asked for.

Mr. RUMSFELD. That's correct.

Mr. SCHOUMACHER. Are you not now willing, in view of this, let's say, fairly substantial sentiment in the House to consider a substitute to try to rescue the bill?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, of course, under our Constitution, the Congress certainly has the prerogative to debate and make changes in legislation. It is my responsibility, as Director of the agency, I think, to indicate what I believe is in the best interests of this country and the best interests of this agency, and this is what I have been attempting to do. I think that there is no question but that it is understandable, that the Congress is reflecting a reaction in the country. My hope and my concern is that I don't want to see the Congress over-react. I don't want to see an over-reaction that would lead to a situation where this country would not be able to deal in an effective way and an aggressive way with the problems of the poor.

Mr. HERMAN. Well, in hardtacks now, Mr. Perkins has got this delayed for a week or two. You have your forces to muster, presumably your biggest gun and your artillery is the President of the United States. I come back to my opening two questions. Perhaps I worded them a little loosely, but my question really basically is this: You have a short time left. All the surveys seem to show that the Democrats are behind you but they need a certain number of Republican votes, and they don't have them. Can you, with the aid of the President—is he going to do something new—can you muster the Republican votes needed to pass the bill the way you want it?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I don't know. Right now, it is close, to be quite honest.

Mr. HERMAN. Is the President going to do something new?

Mr. RUMSFELD. The situation is that there are 435 members of the House. Only 189 of those are Republicans. The vast majority are Democrats and we need a substantial number of Democrats and a substantial number of Republicans to prevail. I have been working on the Hill trying to see as many members in both political parties and to persuade them of the opportunities that we have with this agency to be sure to correct some of the excesses of the past. Now, I have talked with the President about this. I imagine this question would come up on Monday evening. There is no question in my mind but that the President fully supports my position, and he has indicated this on four separate occasions. He has made four statements, and he and I are both excited about the prospects that we have in this administration to have in the Executive Office of the President an agency that can do the important work that he has set forth for us.

Mr. HERMAN. Sir, I know that and the Republicans know that. Now they are all in the past. They were before these amendments were brought up. At this point, as I understand it, you need a third of the House Republicans behind you. Do you think the President can get them for you or that you can get them for yourself?

Mr. RUMSFELD. As I say, I don't know. I think it will be close. We have, I think, something approximating a third of the House Republicans who will be supporting us. We have members of the Republican leadership who are going to be supporting the position we have put forward.

Mr. HERMAN. Which members of the leadership?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Congressman John Anderson, I believe—

Mr. HERMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. RUMSFELD.—and I think Congressman Robert Taft. Both are members of the leadership and have indicated that they are in favor of the President's position. That is my understanding, at any rate.

Mr. NOLAN. In light of your own rhetoric about saying that this is not a massive war on poverty, and in light of the fact that two leading components of OEO, the Job Corps and Headstart, are now gone from your jurisdiction, could you project for us what do you think the future of OEO will be like, say, five or six years from now? What sort of things will you be doing?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, if we look at, I think, the country, at least through my eyes, I see a situation where we have massive federal, state and local expenditures to deal with the problems of the society—in the case of the federal government, close to \$200 billion. We see a shifting of priorities in this country. We see a reduction of defense expenditures. We see a phasing down of the war in Vietnam, base closings, and we see an increase in domestic expenditures. I am concerned. I don't believe that, as we shift priorities—and, indeed, they are shifting—as this happens, I don't believe that it will be desirable for this country to simply put more money into the existing federal programs we have. I don't believe that those faucets are working perfectly. I think some of them are rusted, have barnacles. And I don't think the institutions of this country are functioning in a perfect problem-solving way. And the charter that the President gave the Office of Economic Opportunity and what, if we are successful, will be the case, is that we will see this office embarking on things that are difficult, that are experimental, that are of a research nature, of a program develop nature, to the extent they are successful. We will try to develop them and expand them; to the extent they are not successful, I hope we have the courage to say they are not successful and stop them. But, for example, take the—

Mr. HERMAN. Let me break in right here, Mr. Rumsfeld, for just a moment. We will interrupt at this point, and we will be back to you in a moment.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Rumsfeld, I interrupted you in mid-stream. I apologize for that. I would like you to go on. I would also like, if you will, for you to discuss the problem of legal services under OEO.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Yes, indeed. My thought was this, that we have an agency that is very little understood. What it is, essentially, is 49 health centers, neighborhood health centers that are providing the delivery of health services in a very different way; family planning services across the country; migrants, Indian activities, community action agencies, and also some 1,850 legal services lawyers, a worthy legal services program, for example, to be placed under a state plan approach. I think it is likely that we would have great portions of this country where the poor would not have access to the legal system, the kind of access that the support and counsel that legal services lawyers provide. And I believe that it is providing the poor of this country access to the legal system, is exceedingly important; certainly is the most legal, the most reasonable, the most peaceful way to redress grievances in this society that exists.

Mr. HERMAN. In view of the fact that you have said that these amendments, putting it under state control and so forth, would make administering of the program an absolute nightmare. If these amendments, the Quie and Green amendments, pass, will you stay on as Director of OEO?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, I would think that we have got the conference, we have got the House action before us, we have got the House-Senate conference, I can't believe the Senate would be agreeable to some of these changes—for example, with respect to the VISTA Program. The effect of these amendments, as I understand it—and I must say, it is difficult to speak precisely about the substitute, because it has only been very recently made available, there have been no hearings on it; there has not been an opportunity to study it in complete depth—but the effect on the VISTA Program would amount to abolishing it, for example. There are 6,000 VISTA volunteers around the country. If it were operated on a state plan, that would mean you would have about 120 per state. Well, there is obviously no state that could conduct national recruiting for VISTA or national training. It would be a very different operation.

Mr. HERMAN. Well, on a hypothetical basis, if this should come about, how do you feel about staying on?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would think that what would be done, if something like this were passed and approved when finally finished through the Congress, if it proved to be impossible to administer, that the next course of action would be to come up in January with legislation that would correct the defects, because certainly that is the way our system works between the Executive and the Legislative Branch.

Mr. SCHOUMACHER. I cannot, after reading the Hill testimony back in June and the debate recently on the floor, understand why you feel that the provisions of the substitute are as destructive as you seem to think. According to their sponsors, it is now in the law that a state can declare itself the community action agency and take over the program, with the escape valve that local communities can opt out, that that isn't really changed, and they say that there are six separate controls under their substitute that you would have over the program which, if you were dissatisfied with the state program, you could either close it down or you could still take it over and administer it directly from Washington. It is really as destructive as you're saying?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, of course, what I have said is that insofar as I am able to assess the substitute at this point, I feel it would be very undesirable. The President made a speech called "new federalism," and he talked about four things. He talked about the new family assistance program, which would revamp the welfare system. He talked about manpower training. He talked about revenue sharing, and he talked about the reorganization and the new charter for the Office of Economic Opportunity. In two of those instances, revenue sharing and manpower, he said that we want to have shared responsibility with the states, and we're going to move the responsibility toward the state in those instances. In the other two, in the family assistance system and in the Office of Economic Opportunity, he said that there is an important federal role. For example, in family assistance, he said there is going to be a national minimum, and he said that the federal government would assume a greater part of the role of financing the welfare programs. And, with respect to the Office of Economic Opportunity, he said something essentially the same. He said there is a need in this country for an office, a federal office, that has as its role the development of better ways of delivering services to the people of this country, better ways of improving economic opportunity, better ways of helping individuals improve their capabilities to take advantage of economic opportunities. There is nothing wrong in the world with having the states involved in many of these programs, and they are in the manpower program, and a variety of others.

My point is that I don't think it is healthy for a society to take all of the activities of the society and put them into the same mold, and this is, in effect, what this approach would seem to me to do. Therefore, I must concede there are parts of that substitute that are perfectly acceptable. We are already doing administratively some of the things that are in that substitute.

Mr. SCHOUmacher. Well, Mr. Rumsfeld, aren't you also concerned, as some members of the Congress are, about this so-called "poverty industry" that has grown up? Some of these things seem to be almost the cries of pain of bureaucracy rather than of an agency that just wants freedom to innovate and make test programs.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, I am concerned, and I have indicated publicly my concern about this problem. I indicated, as a member of the Space Committee, when I saw what was happening in the space field. I discussed it, when I was in the Congress, concerning the defense industry. And it is inevitable. It happens. And it is something that our society has to be very alert to avoid, to the extent that we are able. There is no question but that there are a limited number of people in this country who have experience in space, who have experience in activities the nature of which the Office of Economic Opportunity is involved in. I have been attempting to improve the situation, to rewrite the guidelines, and I think we have done a very effective job.

Mr. NOLAN. On May 26, when you were sworn in at the White House, Mr. Nixon said that your first role would be as an assistant to him in regards to the problems of poor people, and only secondarily as Director of OEO and as a member of the Cabinet. Yet, if you were a poor person in the ghetto somewhere, you would look at the television and you would see Gerry Ford coming out of the White House briefing every week and talking one way, and why should he believe you? I am asking particularly in light of the fact that the Catholic Bishops of New York read at every mass in New York State today a letter talking about the growing bitterness and resentment towards the poor, which they said was caused by some of this legislation. So why should any poor person believe you, when so many other figures are talking another way?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, I guess the—I don't know the letter you are referring to, the growing bitterness of the poor or toward the poor?

Mr. NOLAN. Bitterness and resentment of their presence among us is the way the letter reads.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Because it is a comment on the fact that society today—

Mr. NOLAN. Recent legislation that has increased the hardship of many poor people, this is both on the state level—and New York is regarded as a more liberal state than others—

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, I don't know if you are referring to state or federal legislation, but the fact of the matter is that in the nine months this administration has been in office, it has put forward a host of proposals that are still pending before the Congress concerning the welfare system, food and hunger, manpower training, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and I think that it is regrettable that the Congress has not acted on this legislation.

Mr. NOLAN. Yet they are about to cripple the—

Mr. RUMSFELD. The cold hard fact is that this is December. The fiscal year started five and a half months ago. The Office of Economic Opportunity still doesn't have its funds for the fiscal year that began five and a half months ago. This is no way to run a government. Now, we have passed, I think, four appropriation bills in the Congress thus far. This means that not only

can you not plan but it is half through the fiscal year before you even know what you will be getting.

Mr. HERMAN. But, Mr. Rumsfeld, wasn't it the supporters of OEO that, in fact, delayed this program to this point? That is, that they were looking for votes. They didn't have votes until now. Now, at the very end of the session they have tried to push this through, and they have been blocked. It happens all the time on the Hill.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, it shouldn't happen, and I don't know that what you are saying is exactly correct. The fact of the matter is that it has happened with a whole list of pieces of legislation that are still before the Congress, that have not been acted on.

Mr. HERMAN. Well, on poverty, let me take you beyond Congress. I don't think it is fair always to belabor Congress as the villain. Do you think that the American people really are willing to support a massive effort to help the poor? For example, at the recent White House Conference on Hunger, the resolution was passed to seek \$5,500 a year minimum for a poor family of four. Now, the calculations I've seen mean that this would amount to anywhere from \$70 to \$100 billion a year. Now, do you think the American taxpayer, to say nothing of the Congress, do you think the American mediumly-wealthy the American taxpayer is willing to support this kind of increase?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Us.

Mr. HERMAN. Us, you, me, everybody, people who own television sets—the American taxpayer is willing to support, whether Congress will or not, that much of an increase?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, of course, that isn't the recommendation that the President has made. The President has made a recommendation of a family assistance system to increase the coverage to a vast number of individuals.

Mr. HERMAN. I understand, sir, but—

Mr. RUMSFELD. And my point—I have a lot of confidence in the American people, I really do. I think that, when a subject is intelligently discussed and they understand it—the Office of Economic Opportunity is not for the poor. The Office of Economic Opportunity is for this country, and to the extent that we are able to do a good job in dealing with the problems of the poor, we have made this a better society. And we can't have a country where there is a separation, a division between people, and people feel separated from society.

Mr. HERMAN. And yet the relief rolls climbed 10 percent in the last year.

Mr. RUMSFELD. And this, of course, is testimony to the present welfare system, which is clearly a disaster. Everyone agrees with this, and this is why the President of the United States said, "I am not going to walk one more step down that road." This is the reason he has put before the Congress a very new and exciting and very bold program to completely revamp the present system.

Mr. NOLAN. Your own budget preparations—now, you have to prepare a budget that involves the community action program, legal services, VISTA and the rest, is that going to be considerably higher or at the same level as last year, or—

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, of course, we are operating in the blind. The fiscal year is half over. We have already started the '71 budget cycle, as President Nixon recently indicated. It may be that the administration will not be able to come forward with the '71 budget because we don't have the vaguest idea from the Congress what we're going to be operating on during the year that is now half over.

Mr. NOLAN. Well, you must have some guidance from people in the White House and the Budget Bureau.

Mr. RUMSFELD. As I say, we are going

through the Budget Bureau process right now, and we have requested an increase.

Mr. NOLAN. Are they optimistic, generous? How do you—

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, I think it is rather clear, that it is a very difficult thing to build a budget for a year to follow on when you have not really been given any idea of what you are going to be able to have during the preceding year. In just developing a budget proposal, it is practically impossible to do it.

Mr. SCHOUmacher. With the minute or so that we have left, could you put on your presidential counsel hat again and tell us what is the problem of getting a new draft director? Do we have one yet? And have people turned it down? What is going on?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, it is not an area that I have been personally directly involved in. I will say that, from my experience in Congress, having worked to try and bring about changes in the draft system, I am disappointed that the Congress has not moved further along the line that the President has proposed. I am pleased that we have been able to make some changes. I would guess that there would be a decision on a new director of the Selective Service in a very reasonable period of time.

Mr. NOLAN. You're still for the volunteer army, despite the huge costs?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am, indeed, and the cost would not be huge. The money difference is what we are presently taxing people by their service in the military. I think that this country is perfectly capable of paying people what they would be able to make in the civilian competitive manpower market for military service.

Mr. HERMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Rumsfeld, for being with us here today on Face the Nation. We will have a word about next week's guest in a moment.

ANNOUNCER. Today, on "Face the Nation," the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Donald Rumsfeld, was interviewed by CBS News Correspondent David Schoumacher, Martin Nolan, of the Washington Bureau of the Boston Globe, and CBS News Correspondent George Herman.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I walked through the teller line in the Committee of the Whole in favor of State participation in antipoverty programs. I have no apology because my philosophy has always been in support of States rights. I did not act in haste or without a study of our situation in the State of Missouri. I consulted with some of our State officials and with the Governor of our State. It was their conclusion the poverty program would be improved by greater State participation.

While I agreed there may be some improvement achieved through State developed programs I doubt that even such steps can result in enough improvement soon enough as to make this program acceptable by the majority of my constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid it may be heretic to criticize the so-called war on poverty. The reason is there are countless organizations and individuals who feel an honest compassion for the plight of the poor in this country. I share that compassion. But I also have a responsibility and obligation to see that the tax money of our constituents is expended in ways that promise reasonable returns from every expenditure. The facts are that due to the high ratio of cost in relation to benefits there is very little to recommend OEO as a vehicle through which want can be eliminated in this country.

Of course, I am not against the poor. I am against money supposedly directed to the poor never reaching the poor. I am against high administrative costs which eats up all the money before it gets to the poor. I suppose that is why I was in favor of further State participation because I believed money spent by the States would do the most good.

Time will not allow enumeration of but a few of the cases of mishandling of funds under the banner of fighting poverty. Yet everyone knows there have been a countless number of instances of personal enrichment of various individuals connected with the Office of Economic Opportunity. Only today the Washington Post reports the indictment of a minister in Richmond, Va., on a charge of embezzling community action program funds. This is not an isolated news report. It just happened to be one that appeared in the paper today.

Mr. Chairman, were I to support H.R. 12321, the people in my district would know that I support the antics of Pride, Inc., here in Washington, D.C., and its director, Marion Barry. These stories have gone out over the wire services from coast to coast. My people know the Blackstone Rangers in Chicago have been subsidized by so-called poverty funds.

Recently, our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) reports that the General Accounting Office revealed that in one poverty program conducted in his State, involving \$1,100,000, only \$295,000, or less than one-third of the total, actually went in direct benefits to the poor. All the remainder was for administrative expenses, which included about \$100,000 travel expenses. This same kind of situation has been duplicated over and over throughout the United States.

In former years one of the foremost reasons I have opposed the poverty program was because of the imbalance or inequitable distribution of funding between urban and rural areas. That imbalance still exists. Poverty is just as real in rural America as it is in urban America. But the heavy funding goes to the urban areas. Those in charge of the program argue this is necessary to cool off racial motivated violence. On the contrary, I am convinced that in some of the eastern cities the funding provided by OEO has actually contributed to finance unrest and increased racial disturbances.

As in former years, let me make it clear that there are a few cases in the OEO desert of poor management and maladministration. Once again, I wish to compliment and praise the work of the regional office of OEO in Kansas City, Mo., and its fine director, Don Thomason, as well as the members of his excellent staff. Whenever I have complaints about the operation of some of the projects in our congressional district, he always provides a prompt and complete report. Because of the so-called "city hall" amendment he cannot always right the wrongs complained about, but he has offered suggestions which reduce the repetition of complaints that reach our office.

Yes there are some good things going on within the overall poverty program.

Let me take the time to mention a most pleasant experience on Saturday afternoon, November 1, when I had occasion to visit the Sac-Osage Craft Center in Osceola, Mo., in our district. This project funded by the West Central Missouri Rural Development Corp., operating under a very small appropriation in a distinctly rural area is a place where our older people are given a chance to create or produce handicraft objects. They produce wood carvings, make quilts and rugs. They refinish antique furniture and reupholster furniture. All of these items are offered for sale in the craft center to provide added income for the senior citizens of the area who participate in this center. It is a distinct privilege to pay special tribute to Mr. Charles Braithwait, the director and his small staff that have proceeded on a low budget to enrich the lives of the senior citizens of this county. If there were more instances of this sort of good administration OEO would not reap such widespread criticism, but would merit the support of every Member of Congress.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I spoke earlier today on the merits of the proposed Quie-Green substitute to the committee bill. I can add little now to what I said then about the merits, other than to express my amazement that if the substitute would be such an improvement every one seems to want his pet program exempted from its provisions.

I also want to remind my colleagues, especially my Republican colleagues, of something that keeps running through my mind as I listen to the oratory today.

One of America's hardest working, most capable, and most promising public servants is the new Director of the OEO. He was elected repeatedly to this House by overwhelming majorities, and came to be respected as one of the brightest and most dedicated men to serve here during this decade.

Furthermore, he is a Republican. So is the President who appointed him and conferred Cabinet status on him, and who now urges support for him.

I know no one who knows Don Rumsfeld who does not admire his integrity and his dedication to the democratic process and to America.

In view of these facts, much of this discussion baffles me. Is Don Rumsfeld the arrogant "bureaucrat" that the minority leader says he would not accept dictation from? Or was that a reference to the President? Is it the contention of those who are pressing this substitute proposal that Don Rumsfeld is incapable of administering the antipoverty program? If that is the case, was the President misguided to appoint him? Or is the contention that when you appoint a capable administrator the best way to use him is to make sure he has as little as possible to administer?

Let anyone be in any doubt about what the Director of the OEO feels about the vote that is approaching, I am now going to read a statement from him dated December 12, 1969, that is explicit and eloquent about the question now facing us.

STATEMENT OF DONALD RUMSFELD, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, DECEMBER 12, 1969

Since assuming the responsibilities of Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity several months ago, I have repeatedly expressed support for the President's request for an extension of the Act and opposition to a state plan approach. That was my best judgment. It remains my best judgment.

I appreciate the intensive efforts that have been made by many friends of the agency to ameliorate the most objectionable features of the proposed substitute bill. Unfortunately, the end result of that effort has fallen short of what is necessary for an effective program.

While several changes have been made in the substitute bill, the fact remains, by the testimony of the principal author, that they do "not change the substance of the substitute." I agree with that assessment. For that reason it remains my hope that the substitute bill will be defeated.

The Administration has set forth its recommendation. The Senate has supported that position by a vote of 72 to 3. In the event the House adopts a different position, it is my hope and that of the President that the final legislation will meet the requirements for an effective national effort to deal with the problems of the poor.

I believe that this Nation is wise enough and big enough to recognize that there is much work to be done if we are to meet the urgent problems which face society—for the benefit of the poor and the non-poor alike—and get on with the task.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so and who have not had an opportunity to speak on this legislation, may be permitted to insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES), as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. AYRES and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 167, noes 183.

So the substitute amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 101. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for which there are no separate authorizations of appropriations in—

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of

the gentleman from Kentucky if he intends to close off debate and the opportunity to offer amendments?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished friend, we want to close this thing out tonight.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

such Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$1,563,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and such amount as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

Sec. 102. Sections 161, 245, 321, 408, 615, and 835 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are each amended by striking out "1967" and by inserting in lieu thereof "1969". Section 523 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years" and by inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1969, and the three succeeding fiscal years".

TITLE II—SPECIAL WORK AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended redesignating part E as part F, by renumbering section 161 (as amended by section 102 of this Act) as section 171, and by inserting after part D, the following new part:

"PART E—SPECIAL WORK AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 161. The Congress finds that the 'Operation Mainstream' program aimed primarily at the chronically unemployed and the 'New Careers' program providing jobs for the unemployed and low-income persons leading to broader career opportunities are uniquely effective; that, in addition to providing persons assisted with jobs, the key to their economic independence, these programs are of advantage to the community at large in that they are directed at community beautification and betterment and the improvement of health, education, welfare, public safety, and other public services; and that, while these programs are important and necessary components of comprehensive work and training programs, there is a need to encourage imaginative and innovative use of these programs, to enlarge the authority to operate them, and to increase the resources available for them.

"SPECIAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 162. (a) The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to stimulate and support efforts to provide the unemployed with jobs and the low-income worker with greater career opportunity. Programs authorized under this section shall include the following:

"(1) A special program to be known as 'Mainstream' which involves work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, physical condition, obsolete or inadequate skills, declining economic conditions, other causes of a lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands, the rehabilitation of housing, the improvement of public

facilities, and the improvement and expansion of health, education, day care, and recreation services;

"(2) A special program to be known as 'New Careers' which will provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural conditions of the community or area served in fields of public service, including without limitation health, education, welfare, recreation, day care, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for on-the-job training, promotion, and advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement.

"(b) The Director is authorized to provide financial and other assistance to insure the provision of supportive and follow-up services to supplement programs under this part including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in these programs and in employment.

"ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

"SEC. 163. The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, education procedures, availability of in-service training and technical assistance programs, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 164. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant; and

"(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development and upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

"(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

"PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 165. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

"(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

"EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 166. The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this part not more than 12½ per centum shall be used within any one State.

"LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 167. Programs assisted under this part shall be subject to the provision of section 131 of this Act.

"AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 168. For the purpose of carrying out programs under this part, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and such amount as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

TITLE III—SPECIAL COMPREHENSIVE PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS AND PROGRAMS PROVIDING FOR INTENSIVE FOLLOW THROUGH EDUCATION FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Sec. 301. (a) The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE IX—SPECIAL COMPREHENSIVE PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS AND PROGRAMS PROVIDING FOR INTENSIVE FOLLOW THROUGH EDUCATION FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 901. The Congress finds that children participating in Head Start projects and other preschool programs are afforded an increased opportunity for learning and healthy maturation, that more effective and maximum benefits accrue to children participating in preschool programs when special educational programs are provided for such children in the early primary grades immediately following their preschool participation, and that preschool and special educational programs and services provided in the early primary school years afford children with culturally deprived, educationally lacking, or economically distressed family background an essential opportunity to participate in the economic, social, and political mainstream activities of American life. It is the purpose of Congress in this title to afford broad authority to the Director, either acting directly or by delegation pursuant to the provisions of title VI of this Act, to broaden the opportunities of the children described in this paragraph for preschool and early primary education, including provisions for parental and home involvement, utilizing to the maximum extent possible existing agencies and organizations and resources to accomplish such purposes.

"AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 902. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, the Director is authorized to make grants to community action agencies, local educational agencies, or other public or nonprofit agencies with the approval of the appropriate community action agency, or to a local educational agency or other public or nonprofit agency in an area where there is no community action agency. For the purpose of carrying out programs under this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$578,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and such amount as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

"ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 903. The sums which are appropriated or allocated for the purpose of making grants under this title shall be allotted pursuant to section 225 of this Act and such sums and project assistance shall be subject to the provisions of that section.

"USES OF FUNDS

"SEC. 904. (a) Grants made pursuant to this title may be used for (1) the continuation of programs authorized by sections 222(a) (1) and (2) of this Act prior to the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969, and known as 'Project Head Start' and 'Follow Through', where consistent with the purposes of this title, (2) planning for and taking steps leading to the development of early childhood programs for the benefit of children with culturally deprived, educationally lacking or economically distressed family backgrounds, including appropriate arrangements with educational agencies for special educational programs and services for the further intensified provision of educational opportunities for such children during the early years of compulsory school attendance, (3) the provision within such programs of such comprehensive health, nutritional, social, and other services as the Director finds will assist such children in gaining their full potential, (4) providing for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the project operating level, (5) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of preschool and early primary school programs for the children described in this section, including the lease or rental of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment and supplies necessary to provide comprehensive programs as described in this section, (6) the provision of comprehensive physical and mental health services for children needing such assistance in order to profit from educational programs, (7) food and nutritional services, including family consultative and educational programs to improve nutrition in the home, (8) special social services to broaden the educational environment in the homes of the homes of the children participating in such programs, and (9) other social and educational activities, including summer, weekend, and vacation programs for such children which are deemed by the Director to further the purposes of this title."

Sec. 302. Section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) thereof.

TITLE IV—INTENSIVE PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

Sec. 401. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE X—INTENSIVE PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 1001. Congress finds that existing programs aimed at providing surplus foods

and free meals to needy children and families often are structured so as to have no or little impact on extremely economically disadvantaged children and families; that to reach the many victims of such impoverished circumstances, existing programs must be supplemented and broadened to produce effective results; that supplementary activities, requiring improved delivery services, increased family food subsidies, intensive family and child educational components, and emergency family medical services, are required frequently in the homes of the most economically disadvantaged; and that such conditions operate most severely on the elderly and the very young. It is the purpose of this title to provide broad authority to meet such needs expeditiously.

"AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FOOD AND MEDICAL SERVICES AND SUPPLIES

"SEC. 1002. The Director is authorized to provide, directly or by delegation of authority pursuant to the provisions of title VI of this Act, financial assistance for the provision of such medical supplies and services, nutritional foodstuffs, and related services, as may be necessary to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. Such assistance may be provided by way of supplement to such other assistance as may be extended under the provisions of other Federal programs, and may be used to extend and broaden such programs to serve extremely economically disadvantaged families with particular emphasis on the elderly and the extremely young where such services are not now provided and without regard to the requirements of such laws for local or State administration or financial participation. In extending such assistance, the Director may make grants to community action agencies or local public or private nonprofit organizations or agencies to carry out the purposes of this title. The Director is authorized to carry out the functions under this title through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in a manner that will insure the availability of such foodstuffs, medical services and supplies through a community action agency where feasible, or other agencies or organizations if no such agency exists or is able to administer programs to provide such foodstuffs, medical services, and supplies to needy individuals and families.

"AREAS OF SPECIAL EMPHASIS

"SEC. 1003. The Director shall take steps to assure that programs under this title shall be designated to deal particularly with the incidence of malnutrition, hunger and serious medical needs among persons in economically disadvantaged circumstances who are fifty-five years of age and older and young children. In the conduct of such programs, the Director shall encourage the employment of such elderly persons as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in programs designed to carry out the provisions of this title.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 1004. For the purpose of carrying out programs under this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$92,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and such amount as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

Sec. 402. Section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

AMENDMENT OF RURAL LOAN PROGRAM

Sec. 501. Section 302(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "such families, and" and inserting "such families, or".

AVAILABILITY OF LEGAL SERVICES TO ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

Sec. 502. Section 222(a) (3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended

by adding at the end thereof the following: "Members of the Armed Forces, and members of their immediate families, shall be eligible to obtain legal services under such programs in cases of extreme hardship (determined in accordance with regulations of the Director issued after consultation with the Secretary of Defense). The costs of providing such services shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of Defense."

APPLICABILITY TO TRUST TERRITORY

Sec. 503. Section 609(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and title II" and inserting "title II, title III-A, and title IV".

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, every Member realizes that we are considering a very important bill. It means a great deal to countless millions of human beings in America, human beings like ourselves. The Committee of the Whole has defeated the substitute amendment, an action which I strongly supported. I assume the amendment will be the subject of a motion to recommit. At that time we must keep in mind that the substitute essentially turns control of the entire poverty program over to the States and thereby interposes another level of government. This will slow down assistance to the poor. In so doing the substitute attacks the basic concept of the 1964 law that local communities should identify the causes of poverty in their areas, as the local people know their problems, and also the local communities should design and carry out such programs.

The committee bill calls for a 2-year extension, which President Nixon called for and requested; but it also provides additional funds, authorized funds for, one, Headstart; two, Headstart Follow Through; three, emergency food and medical services; four, Operation Mainstream and New Careers, which relates to manpower programs.

I am sure that everyone here recognizes the justification for these programs that I have just mentioned that are included in the committee bill and for which additional funds are requested.

Under the substitute the State is placed in charge of the Community Action moneys, substituting itself for the local government. The additional money for these programs is \$295 million over the substitute.

Practically all church organizations testified in support of an extension of the program and for additional funds, especially in the hunger and medical programs, Operation Mainstream, and New Careers.

The substitute adds three more worthy programs, I will admit, but, the substitute will add, as I understand it, if offered as it was a little while ago, three more programs, but it does not provide additional funds to finance them, which means that programs already in opera-

tion would have to suffer a reduction in the allocation of funds and a reduction in the existing programs themselves, those programs being Headstart, emergency food and medical programs, consumer education programs and neighborhood service programs.

So I hope when a motion to recommit is offered, Members will realize what is included in the substitute. It will slow down the program.

Mistakes, yes. We make mistakes in connection with our duties as we look back. But a decided improvement has been made all along, through the time the antipoverty program has been in existence; it is doing a good job and is improving.

I hope that when the substitute is offered on a motion to recommit, the House at that time will defeat the motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUBSER

Mr. GUBSER, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: Immediately following section 502, insert the following:

"LIMITATION ON LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

SEC. 303. Section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out 'counseling, education, and other appropriate services' and inserting in lieu thereof 'legal counseling, education in legal matters, and other appropriate legal services'."

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. PERKINS, Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS, Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of accepting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman for his gracious consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the section number be renumbered so that I am amending the proper section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I realize that everyone is anxious to vote on the bill. I believe it would be proper for me to explain what the motion to recommit will be.

The motion to recommit will be the substitute which was previously offered, including the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH), which was added to the substitute, and any other amendments which were adopted to the substitute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand the situation, the motion to recommit will be the Ayres substitute, with

the Esch amendment, and the Gubser amendment. In addition, it would include, as I understand it, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Let me add this, if I may, Mr. Chairman: If the substitute is not approved on a rollcall vote—and of course there will be one—then we will have a choice to vote for or against the committee version which, as I recollect, is the dollar recommendation of the Nixon administration plus \$300 million extra.

I say to some of my friends on this side of the aisle, if you want to end up adding \$300 million to the budget recommendation of the administration I hope you do it with your eyes wide open. It seems to me the better approach is to accept the substitute with the amendments that were included when the Committee of the Whole was working its will.

I therefore urge most strongly that the motion to recommit be approved, which is the dollar amount recommended by the President. In the final analysis, analyze where you are if the motion to recommit is disapproved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we may be able to vote in a very few minutes. I am most hopeful that we will be able to vote down the motion to recommit.

The action taken here in the last hour displays that little thought had been given to this substitute. There is no protection in the substitute for a local community, for a municipality, for a local community action agency. They cannot opt out of a State plan. If they do there is no funding available for their program.

Now, if you will remember, under section 253 any State which has in operation a State development and coordination program the State plan covers all community action programs and most title II money will be disbursed in accordance with the State plan. In my judgment this will destroy initiative at the local level.

A local community action agency can be completely ignored. As I stated earlier there is much more sense in placing the cities in charge of this program than putting the States in charge under the pretense of coordination. The priorities of local officials and members of the community may be thrown in the waste paper basket at the State level if such priorities are in conflict with the State plan.

Mr. Chairman, this House should vote against this substitute because if we do not we may do terrific damage to the ghetto areas of the country. Poor rural areas will never have a voice. In other words, there is no meaningful opt out for a poor community in this substitute anywhere. There is no opting out, and I know the sponsors of the substitute will not contend that there is any opting out since most title II funds will only be available for programs in the State plan.

Mr. CAREY, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky is making a very important statement and I want him to confirm my judgment in regard to what was said by the distinguished minority leader with regard to the money contained in this bill and the Nixon program and the budget estimates of the Nixon administration.

I am sure that the distinguished minority leader did not intend to mislead this Committee by indicating there was \$300 million in this bill in addition and that the substitute was in accordance with the Nixon budget estimates.

I know that the gentleman from Kentucky will agree with me that there are three new programs contained in the substitute, none of which have been priced out. There is the emergency food and medical services. Operation Mainstream, and New Careers as well as Headstart and Follow Through which involve millions and millions more. So, this could be a \$1 billion additional authorization on an open-ended basis with no price tag and, therefore, we do not know what the ultimate cost will be.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. Let me say to the minority leader that we added \$188 million for Headstart and Follow Through, because we are currently taking care of only 10 percent of the poor children in the Nation today. For the hunger and malnutrition and medical services program, we added \$62 million. For New Careers and for Mainstream which provides jobs and training for the hard-core unemployed, we added \$54 million.

If we vote for this motion to recommit, we are voting against the advice of the administration and we are voting against the hard-core unemployed and the little children who desperately need child-development services. We must vote down the motion to recommit.

Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry to hear the argument made by my dear friend from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, because it brought back many memories of great fights in this body in years gone by where the basic issue was money values versus human values.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) has shown that the substitute actually reduces the authorization by establishing three more worthy programs, but not provided for is the financing which would have to be taken out of the existing programs.

So, the real basic issue here, regardless of what my friend from Michigan has said, is materialism versus idealism and money values against human values.

Mrs. GREEN or Oregon, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have felt very strongly that there are many, many things wrong with the present OEO—the so-called War on Poverty and I have fought for changes that I believe should be made in the program, not on the basis that I am against the poor, but rather that I am in favor of the money going

to the poor instead of to big corporations—to those who benefit financially—to those who benefit by retaining the status quo.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak long tonight, but I do believe that the record ought to at least reflect what is accurate and what is truthful about the substitute bill.

First of all, under the present legislation a State can be a community action agency. That is the law at the present time. It has been violated by the Office of Economic Opportunity. If the law were enforced any State today that wanted to could be designated as a community action agency, and it would have total authority over all programs, over all policies, and over all funding, everything that could be done under the substitute bill. I cannot believe that the legislative branch charged with writing the laws is going to give a vote of confidence to an agency that repeals the law by guidelines and regulation. Even though you may have voted against the amendment and the bill in 1967—surely you do not give your blessing to an executive branch agency that refuses to follow the law. If so, we embark upon a new era in Government.

The statement has been made over and over that a city cannot opt out. That simply is not true. But those who repeat it must have taken their line from Alice in Wonderland: "What I tell you three times is so." If there is a State community action agency a city can opt out the same as they can at the present time. There was no change in that, and I think the record should present the true facts on it.

In terms of the new programs, I regret very much that these new programs were not included. I think it is actually disgraceful in the United States today that we have, according to the estimates—in writing to the 50 States—about 10,000 families of GI's who are living below the poverty level. We pay money—all kinds of money in the poverty program to finance people who are not half as deserving. We have paid money to people who have demonstrated in the streets, who have made threats, who have contributed to violence. I think the families of the GI's—GI's who are in Vietnam or other places, who do not have the rights of the veterans because they are not veterans, should be taken care of, and we make no provision for these families. In the substitute bill—we direct OEO to pay the difference between what that family now has and the amount to bring them up to the poverty level. The estimates are that there are about 10,000 families. This might cost \$10 million. But if it were to cost \$50 million, we could spend it better this way than the money that goes to private corporations, a half billion dollars. From this saving, we would certainly be able to pay for these cash amounts to families of veterans.

Then we have heard so much in the House in the last 2 days about the elderly—about the inadequate social security payments, and we simply said as a pilot project that we would take those elderly people over 65 who are below the poverty level that the Government itself

sets, and we would give them the amount to bring them up to that poverty level. It would be given on the basis of their needs, not on the basis of every social security recipient.

The third program which we suggest was the amendment which is in the Senate bill which will go to conference anyhow, that was offered by Senator HUGHES of Iowa, that would provide for an alcoholic program. I do not know of any single thing that has impoverished more Americans today than the question of alcoholism.

These are the three programs that we felt needed the funds. That we could save money, that money which is going to the private profitmaking corporations, that was spent on the Blackstone Rangers in Chicago, the Black Panthers in Cleveland, and a lot of other groups who are able bodied and who could get out and work. If we are really concerned about poverty, if we mean what we say—these are three areas where poverty funds could and should be spent.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I rise, simply to set the record straight. The substitute is not an effort to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity, but it is rather an effort to coordinate the programs, to take all of the multitudinous programs that we have in the Federal and State Governments, and to give people at the State level a chance to coordinate those programs so that the money would go where it would do the most good.

The other amendments on preventing political activity by OEO employees, putting a stop to nepotism—putting a stop to paying dues to lobby organizations out of Federal funds—these you know are part of the substitute. The opportunity presents itself to make meaningful changes—stop the abuses or continue for 2 more years what has become a disgraceful program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin: On page 16, line 10, after the period insert:

"Sec. 504. Notwithstanding any other provision of this bill the total expenditures authorized for programs authorized in their bill shall not exceed \$2,048,000,000."

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is perhaps not what I would like to have offered.

I would prefer to offer an amendment striking all that was added by the committee.

What this amendment does and what its effect is intended to be is to reduce the level of expenditures authorized in the committee bill by \$295 million.

The adoption of the amendment would put the bill back in the form recommended by the Nixon administration, and agreed to by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee who is a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 12321, and myself, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), the Director of the OEO and others, at a level of \$2,048,000,000.

I made it clear and I say again to the Committee, it is always difficult to justify going beyond the expenditure level recommended by the administration—and I opposed reporting this bill on that basis because of all the additional funds and new programs.

If this amendment is adopted, it seems to me we clear the air and we put the committee bill back in the posture that it was prior to the additions of \$295 million. I think it would give a chance to the House to work its will in a way that will enable us to preserve the agency and its integrity, and to preserve the action of the House, the budget and the posture of the administration in this instance.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. What the gentleman is really doing is taking recognition of the facts that exist. There was no money in the HEW appropriation bill that passed the House. The Senate has marked up the bill. They put in \$1.948 billion. Therefore, under the rules that is the most money that the conferees can agree upon for this year, anyway. So what you are really doing is recognizing the facts of life. We could put \$5 billion into this authorization, but under our procedures here, we cannot appropriate that kind of money. You are just recognizing the facts.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman who is in the well for offering an amendment that I think is in keeping with fiscal responsibility. We have heard over and over again that the brunt of inflation is always borne by the poor. I think even in this instance, where I support our Director and his program, in view of the fact that we are almost 6 months into the present fiscal year and due to an inflationary condition in the country, I would hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will join in supporting what I think is a highly responsible effort.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate very much the gentleman's contribution and his support of the amendment.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

I hope it is realized what this amendment is doing. You may talk about inflation. But it seems to me that we should not ask the poor people of this Nation to pay for the prosperity of some of us. Since January of this year 350,000 persons have lost their jobs. Since June of last year more than 1 million cases have been added to the welfare rolls. What you are doing, if you do not accept the committee bill, you are then saying to the poor people of this country, "You alone should bear the cost of trying to maintain price stability." By this amendment you will say to 175,000 children in Headstart, "You will not have an opportunity in life to get a decent educa-

tion." And also to 62,000 Follow Through, "We are going to cut you off." You will reduce the amount of emergency food and medical attention by \$75 million to merely \$17 million. You will say then to 15 million starving Americans, "We do not care anything about you."

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I have great respect for the gentleman in the well, but I think it would be totally unfair and completely wrong to characterize an amendment of this kind, which reduces something which has not been available before, as a barrier to opportunity. As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) pointed out, the budget level will be even below the \$2.048 billion provided. That is what Congress will appropriate. Let us not go through the charade of saying that we are taking things out of the mouths of children when they never had it in the first place.

Mr. HAWKINS. That is not true. In a change of policy adopted by this administration since the first of this year the Headstart project has been changed so that the summer programs are not now available, and the amount of money which will then be available will mean, unless extra money is appropriated, that this number, 175,000 children, will not have slots in that program. And to say, as you do, if we do not appropriate the money, then you have done no harm, but how in the world can you, in spite of the need, the demonstrated need, since the first of this year—and conditions are not as good this year as they were last year—how can you say then, with a greater need, that we should now authorize less than was authorized 2 years ago?

That is a fact, and that is what your amendment is doing. Now, if you want to do that, then I go back to what the Speaker has already said. You are voting not for human rights; you are voting for so-called price stability. I agree we should fight inflation, but I say at the time we fight inflation let us have some special programs to take care of those who will be injured by the economic policies that are now operating under this administration, and I say started under the past administration, so it is not a partisan issue. It is a fact that we are worse off today and that consequently we should vote more money and certainly not less money.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. I think the gentleman well knows that there are 25 million poor people in this country. We are authorizing roughly \$2 billion. That works out to a grand total of 21 cents a day for those people. I think we can afford to do a little better than that. Does not the gentleman think so?

Mr. HAWKINS. If we cannot, then we certainly should not be talking about sending planes to China.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 93, noes 111. So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE: On page 16 after line 10 insert the following:

"AUTHORIZATION OF NARCOTIC ADDICT RECOVERY PROGRAM

"Sec. 504. Section 222(a) of such Act is further amended by adding to the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) A 'Narcotic Addict Recovery' program designed to discover and bring about post and/or preinstitutional treatment for narcotic addiction. Such a program shall be community based, with appropriate participation by parents, youth, educators and others in the community, serve the objective of maintaining the family structure as well as the recovery of the individual addict, encourage the use of neighborhood facilities and the services of former addicts as program workers and facilitate the re-entry of addicts into society. Such a program shall also emphasize the coordination and full utilization of existing community services which pertain to the treatment of addiction and/or related disorders."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would provide a narcotic addict recovery program on a community base and with community participation. Institutional treatment of narcotic addiction poses two problems:

First. Institutional treatment facilities are very overcrowded and cannot handle even the known addicts.

Second. Institutional addiction treatment facilities that are removed from the addict's community cannot adequately prepare the addict for the stresses he experiences upon return to his community.

The program would provide a variety of supportive services for the addict while he was awaiting assignment to a treatment facility and when he returns from one.

The utilization of community persons and former addicts will bring persons known and familiar to the addict in contact with him. This familiarity will inspire trust by the addict—a trust that officials from "downtown" have difficulty inspiring.

Involvement of community persons in the problems of addiction in their own community will serve as an educational and prevention program. In many low-income communities, narcotics addiction is a problem that affects almost every family. Involvement of the community in the treatment of addicts can alert them both to the dangers of narcotics—of which the adults, if not the youth, are aware—and, most important, that addiction can be prevented and that they can help. Families in low-income communities often feel helpless before the threat of narcotics addiction in their neighborhoods. This program would allow them to take effective action.

This program, since it is OEO, would be restricted largely to low-income neighborhoods, where the problem of "hard-core" narcotics is centered.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me state to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that his amendment was accepted a few moments ago to the substitute, and I do not know of any objection from this side of the aisle to the gentleman's amendment, and it will be accepted.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have concluded, or about concluded, the debate on this very important bill. It has been a splendid debate.

I must say, as the majority whip, I have been very proud to see the large attendance of Members on the floor on both sides of the aisle.

Soon we will be confronted with voting again on the substitute offered earlier here today and defeated in the Committee by a teller vote. That vote may be very close. I sincerely hope that the motion to recommit will be defeated in the full House as the substitute as defeated in the Committee a moment ago.

To change now a program which is only beginning to be felt and change its national impact would in my judgment be the height of folly.

Mr. Chairman, it is my contention that those who support the committee are actually lending support to the President in that he has come into this body and selected one of our most able younger Members on the Republican side of the aisle and asked him to head up the program. At the time of his appointment the President announced that he would have Cabinet status.

I cannot believe that a few months thereafter we will, in effect, turn back the clock and scuttle a program which, whether you believe it or not, has been tremendously helpful to the poor people of this country. I can only speak from experience. I have the great privilege of representing one of the large cities in the South, a city which has a very diversified population and a long history, but a city which also has the same problems that every other large city in this Nation is confronted with; namely, the tremendous increase, particularly in the inner city, of people who unfortunately are not skilled, not trained and in many instances with no education at all.

Now, since we have adopted this program, men and women have gone into the poor areas of my city with the Headstart program where we had children who could not articulate the simplest words in the English language at ages 5 and 6 but where we brought them in and taught them and in a matter of several years made them a part of the community where they could function.

The community action programs have been most successful in my city, a Southern city, and headed up by men and women of dedication and not people who are corrupt or scheming or graspy or greedy and who try to live as octopuses on the body politic. They are dedicated

people trying to do a job for their fellow citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we ought to make a mistake about what we do here today. I do not think we ought to sail under any false colors. If we vote to dismantle this program now we are saying to the millions and millions of disadvantaged citizens of our country of all types and backgrounds that we have indeed turned our backs on you and we have left you to do as best you can in this highly complex, violent, and complex society in which we live.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the motion to recommit will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12321) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 734, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. AYRES

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. AYRES. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AYRES moves to recommit the bill H.R. 12321 to the Committee on Education and Labor, with instructions that it be reported back forthwith, with all after the enacting clause struck out, and the following substitute inserted in lieu thereof:

That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969."

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 101. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2,048,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971.

Sec. 102. Sections 161, 245, 321, 408, 615, and 835 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are each amended by striking out "1967" and by inserting in lieu thereof

"1969". Section 523 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years" and by inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1969, and the three succeeding fiscal years".

TITLE II—STATE PARTICIPATION IN ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out section 231 (relating to "State Agency Assistance") and by inserting at the end of the title a new part, as follows:

"PART E—PARTICIPATION OF STATES

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 250. It is the purpose of this part to provide an effective mechanism for the positive involvement of State officers, agencies, and administrative resources in the development, carrying out, and coordination of anti-poverty programs within each State, but only if and to the extent a State exercises the options set forth in this part. Accordingly, no State shall be required to establish a State Economic Opportunity Office described in section 251, or to take the further actions outlined in this part, as a condition for the support of programs under this Act in the State. In the event a State shall not choose to participate in the manner provided in this part, or is unable to satisfy the requirements for such participation set forth in this part, the Director shall continue to support eligible programs and projects in such State. However, the Director shall take every appropriate action to encourage effective State participation under this part in accordance with the finding of the Congress that such participation will strengthen the programs authorized by this Act.

"STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 251. (a) The Director shall provide financial assistance to the State Economic Opportunity Office (hereinafter referred to as the 'State Office') designated in accordance with State law, to enable such agency—

"(1) to advise the Governor of the State with respect to the policies and programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity and other resources available to combat poverty within the State, and at the request of the Governor to advise and assist him in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act;

"(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title and to title VIII;

"(3) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title and under title VIII;

"(4) to evaluate programs assisted under this title and under title VIII with a view to improving the capacity of their sponsors to fulfill the purposes of this Act and to utilize with maximum efficiency the financial assistance provided;

"(5) to evaluate State poverty-related programs and State administrative procedures and to develop mechanisms for making them more responsive to the needs of the poor;

"(6) to conduct financial audits of programs within the State supported under this title or under title VIII, at such times and in such a manner as to promote responsible financial management of such programs;

"(7) to mobilize and develop available resources at the State level needed to assist anti-poverty measures within the State;

"(8) to encourage the development of career opportunities for the poor within agencies of State government;

"(9) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies under this Act; and

"(10) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 631 of this Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede

effective State involvement in or coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

"(b) The Director shall take steps as will assure that:

"(1) all applications for assistance under this title and under title VIII within a State are submitted through the State Office, and that the Office is afforded a reasonable opportunity (but not to exceed 30 days) to review such applications before transmitting them to the Director (or to his delegate) with such comments and recommendations as the State may deem appropriate;

"(2) each State Office receives advance notice of the proposed approval of any application for assistance or of the proposed funding in the State of any program, project, or other activity under any other title in this Act, and is afforded a reasonable opportunity to comment upon such proposed approval or funding; and

"(3) each State Office receives such other information and technical assistance, and is afforded such other opportunities to play an affirmative role in the programs financed under this Act, as may be required to carry out effectively the functions specified in subsection (a).

"(c) (1) Whenever a State Office (with the concurrence of the Governor) shall recommend against the approval of an application submitted under subsection (b)(1), such application shall not be approved (or shall not be approved without changes suggested by the State Office (for funding under this title unless the Director shall have made a finding that approval of such application would strengthen the overall program plan of a local community action agency; or with respect to applications submitted by other eligible applicants, that the approval of such application would be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

"(2) The Director shall not delegate the responsibility for making the finding required in paragraph (1) except to the heads of other federal agencies, and he shall not make such finding without having first afforded the State Office notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(d) In any grants to or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the State Offices established under subsection (a), or which have been developed by and will be carried on with the assistance of those Offices.

"(e) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States or State agencies for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this Act.

"STATE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

"SEC. 252. (a) Any State which desires to participate in the development and carrying out of a State developmental and coordinating program for rural and urban community action, as provided by section 253, shall establish a State Economic Opportunity Council (hereinafter referred to as the 'State Council'), appointed by the Governor, which shall be broadly representative of the economic, educational, health, religious, and social services resources of the State and of the public, including persons representative of—

"(1) urban areas;

"(2) rural areas;

"(3) the poor (including representatives both of the urban and rural poor and of racial and ethnic groups in the State which experience a high incidence of poverty);

"(4) business, industry, and labor;

"(5) elected municipal officials;

"(6) elected county officials;

"(7) federally-assisted programs, such as Model Cities and manpower training, related to the problems of the poor; and

"(8) fields of professional competence (including both public and private education) in dealing with the problems of poverty.

"(b) The State Council shall advise the State Office on the development of and policy matters arising in the administration of the State developmental and coordinating programs submitted pursuant to section 253, and shall evaluate the programs, services, and activities assisted under this title and make a public report (at least annually) of the results of such evaluations.

"(c) The State Council shall prepare a long-range program plan (or, as may be appropriate from time to time, revisions or supplements to such plan) for use of funds under sections 221 and 222 and title VIII of this Act which plan (1) is prepared in consultation with the the State Office, (2) extends over a period of not less than five years and (3) taking into consideration available resources, sets forth a program of action which, in the judgment of the Council, would assure substantial progress toward achievement of the objectives of the plan.

"(d) From the sums appropriated under the authority of this Act for any fiscal year the Director shall (in accordance with regulations) pay to each State Council an amount equal to the reasonable amounts expended by it in carrying out its functions under this part in such fiscal year, except that the amount available for such purpose shall not exceed \$150,000 and shall not be less than \$50,000.

"STATE DEVELOPMENTAL AND COORDINATION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 253. (a) Any State desiring to carry out a developmental and coordination program for urban and rural community action shall submit to the Director (at such time and in such detail as he may specify and containing such information as he may deem necessary) an outline for such a program which—

"(1) has been prepared by the State Office in consultation with the State Council of that State and has been approved by the State Council;

"(2) designates the State Office as the sole agency for administration of the State program, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local community action agencies;

"(3) sets forth in detail the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in the distribution of funds to local community action agencies in the State and for the uses of such funds for the various programs and program components specified in sections 221 and 222, which policies and procedures assure that—

"(A) due consideration will be given to the relative needs of urban and rural areas within the State, and to the needs of various categories of persons living in poverty, in accordance with criteria supplied by the Director; and

"(B) due consideration will be given to periodic evaluations of programs, services, and activities assisted under this title;

"(4) describes how the activities and projects to be carried out under the program are related to the long-range program plan developed by the State Council pursuant to section 251(c) (except that such requirement may be waived during the first year the program is in operation);

"(5) sets forth policies and procedures satisfactory to the Director for approval of applications for assistance under sections 221 and 222 of this title and under title VIII submitted by local community action agencies and other qualified applicants, and for the evaluation, review, and monitoring of the program conducted by such applicants (including procedures to assure that such

programs conform to the requirements of this Act);

"(6) sets forth procedures designed to improve the coordination of programs funded under this part with State-administered programs affecting the poor;

"(7) provides that any community action agency, or other public or private agency which is a qualified applicant for program assistance under this title, dissatisfied with a final action with respect to any application for funds under this title shall be given reasonable notice and opportunity for a public hearing by the State Office;

"(8) provides assurances that federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement, and to the extent possible increase the amount of State, local, and private funds that would in the absence of federal funds be made available for programs supported under this part, and in no case supplant such State, local, and private funds;

"(9) provides assurances satisfactory to the Director that all relevant requirements of this Act shall be complied with, and provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information and affording such access thereto as the Director may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act; and

"(10) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to qualified applicants) under this title.

"(b)(1) The Director shall by regulation establish criteria for approval of State developmental and coordination programs submitted pursuant to subsection (a), and when he finds that such a program complies with such criteria and the requirements of this part and when he is satisfied that adequate procedures are set forth to insure that the assurances and provisions of such program will be carried out, he shall approve such program, and the Director shall not finally disapprove any program submitted.

"(2) The Director shall take such steps as he deems necessary to assure that in the formulation and carrying out of State programs there is close liaison between the State offices and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

"(3) The Director shall take final action to approve or disapprove a State developmental and coordination program submitted under subsection (a) within ninety days after the date of its submission (or resubmission in the event it should have been withdrawn by the State), and he may not delegate the authority to approve or disapprove such programs to any other person.

"(c)(1) For any fiscal year in which any State has in operation a State developmental and coordination program approved in accordance with this part the Director shall make available to such State for carrying out the approved program the sums allotted to such State for such year under section 225(a) and (b); *Provided, however*, That, until June 30, 1971, the Director may reserve not more than one-fourth such amount, to assist (in accordance with the provisions of this title) activities and projects in such State which are not funded under the State program, but only if the Director has determined that the failure to support such activities and projects during the period in which he may reserve funds would result in a substantial disruption of efforts directed toward the elimination of poverty in such State, or that it is necessary to assist programs authorized under section 222 of this Act.

"(2) The Director shall pay, from the amount available to the State for assistance under this part, to each State the amount required to pay the Federal share of carrying out activities and projects under the approved State program, and for administra-

tion of the State program (except that sums paid for State administration shall not exceed five per centum of the amount available to the State for assistance under this title in any fiscal year), and such payments may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"(3) The term "State administration" in paragraph (2) means those costs attributable to the supervision, auditing, coordination, and servicing of activities carried out under this part or to the provision of technical services (including the training of personnel needed to provide such services), and similar costs related to carrying out an approved State program, but shall not include the costs of State operation of a substantive program authorized by this Act.

"(d)(1) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State Office administering a State program approved under subsection (a), finds that—

"(A) the State program has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

"(B) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Director shall notify such State Office that no further payments will be made to the State under the State program (or, in his discretion, that further payments to the State under the program will be limited to activities under or portions of such program not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Director shall support eligible community action and VISTA volunteer programs in such State in accordance with other provisions of this title (except that he may support those activities under or portions of the State program not affected by such failure).

"(2) A State Office which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Director under this subsection or subsection (b) may appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Director, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Director thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Director or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Director may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Director as to the facts, if supported by substantive evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Director to take further evidence, and the Director may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Director shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Director's action.

"EXEMPTION OF HEADSTART PROGRAMS

"SEC. 254. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (during any period in which he has been delegated responsibility for the administration of those programs au-

thorized under section 222(a) (1) and 222(a) (2) of this Act) may exempt such programs from inclusion under the provisions of this part (either generally or with respect to inclusion in the program approved for a particular State)".

TITLE III—TECHNICAL AND PERFECTING AMENDMENTS

PART A—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II ("COMMUNITY ACTION")

COMPOSITION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

SEC. 301. Section 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended as follows:

(1) Clause (3) of subsection (b) is amended to read—

"(3) the remainder of the members (which shall consist of not less than one-quarter of the total membership of such board) are appointed by the elected public officials who serve on or have representatives serving on the board, and are officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups and interests in the community."; and

(2) the first sentence of subsection (c) is amended to read—

"Where a community action agency places responsibility for major policy determinations with respect to the character, funding, extent, and administration of and budgeting for programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area within the community in a subsidiary board, council, or similar agency, such boards, council, or agency shall be broadly representative of such area, and it shall be so constituted as to assure that at least one-third of the members are public officials, appointed by the elected public officials who serve (or appoint representatives to serve) on the board of the community action agency, unless the number of such officials reasonably available or willing to serve is less than one-third of the membership of the subsidiary board."

COSTS OF DEFENDING LAW SUITS

SEC. 302. Section 222(a) of such Act is amended by adding to paragraph (3) (relating to "Legal Services") the following:

"Whenever a lawsuit or other legal action is initiated by a plaintiff or plaintiffs with assistance under this program, and such action results in a verdict or other outcome favorable to the defendant in such lawsuit or other legal action, and the United States shall be liable for such costs (to be paid out of funds made available for the Legal Services program) as are ordered in accordance with the law of the jurisdiction, by the court or other board or agency which has jurisdiction of the matter, the same as a private person."

LIMITATION ON LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

SEC. 303. (a) Section 222(a) (3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "counseling, education, and other appropriate services" and inserting in lieu thereof "legal counseling, education in legal matters, and other appropriate legal services".

(b) The fourth sentence of section 222(a) (3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting "(A)" after "this part" shall be utilized" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or (B) for any activity not directly related to the provision of services referred to in the first sentence of this paragraph and litigation on behalf of specific clients shall be conducted in accordance with the canons of professional ethics of the American Bar Association."

APPLICABILITY OF CANONS OF ETHICS IN LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

(c) The second sentence of section 222(a) (3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting "(A)" after "assures" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (B)

that the Canons of Professional Ethics promulgated by the American Bar Association will be complied with".

(b) Section 222(a) (3) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall receive any complaints or allegations which may be made concerning the conduct of programs under the second sentence of this paragraph, insofar as they relate to matters involving subject matter cognizable by the courts of the United States. The Director of such Office shall make an annual summary of such complaints or allegations, which shall be objective in character and without evaluation or comment. Such summaries shall be available upon request to a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, and shall, at least once each year, be submitted to the Senate and House of Representatives."

AUTHORIZATION OF ALCOHOLIC RECOVERY PROGRAM

SEC. 304. Section 222(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) An 'Alcoholic Recovery' program designed to discover and bring about treatment for the disease of alcoholism. Such a program shall be community based, serve the objective of maintaining the family structure as well as recovery of the individual alcoholic, encourage the use of neighborhood facilities and the services of recovered alcoholics as program workers and emphasize the reentry of alcoholics into society rather than the institutionalization of alcoholics. Such a program shall also emphasize the coordination and full utilization of existing appropriate community services which pertain to the treatment of alcoholism and/or related disorders."

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO FAMILIES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES IN HARDSHIP CASES; PILOT PROJECTS OF ASSISTANCE FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

SEC. 305. Section 232 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) The Director shall conduct projects, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, under which funds available under this section will be used to raise the income levels of families of members of the Armed Forces, when such families reside in the United States and through exceptional circumstances have an income level below the poverty level (as determined by the Director), and preference shall be given to cases of greatest hardship. Projects under this subsection shall be developed jointly by the Director and the Secretary of Defense.

"(h) The Director shall also conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, pilot projects under which funds available under this section will be used to raise the income levels of persons over 65 years of age above the poverty level (as determined by the Director), with preference given to cases of exceptional hardship, in order to examine and evaluate systems of income maintenance for the elderly poor as an alternative to welfare assistance."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT OF GOVERNOR'S VETO PROVISION

SEC. 306. Section 242 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting: " Provided, however, That this section shall not apply with respect to any application which the State Office has recommended not be approved under section 251(c) (1)."

AUTHORIZATION OF STATE AUDIT

SEC. 307. Section 243 of such Act is amended by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(e) The Director shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that programs assisted under this title shall be subject to

financial audit by appropriate State officials and agencies at the request of such officials and agencies, and he shall direct the governing board of such community action agency to cooperate in carrying out such audits."

PART B—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI (ADMINISTRATION)

PROHIBITION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITY STRENGTHENED

SEC. 321. Section 603(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For purposes of chapter 15 of title 5 of the United States Code any overall community action agency which assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating communitywide antipoverty programs, or any agency assuming part or all of such responsibilities (including the administration of components of a community action program) under delegation from an overall community action agency, and receives assistance under this Act, shall be deemed to be a State or local agency."

ANTI-RIOT PROVISION STRENGTHENED

SEC. 322. Section 613 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 613. No individual employed or assigned by any community action agency or any other agency assisted under this Act shall (whether or not pursuant to or during the performance of services rendered in connection with any program or activity conducted or assisted under this Act) plan, initiate, participate in, or otherwise aid or assist in the conduct of any unlawful demonstration, rioting, or civil disturbance, and the Director shall take such steps as may be necessary to assure that any individual who violates this provision is removed from his employment or assignment in programs conducted or assisted under this Act."

PROHIBITIONS ON UPWARD BOUND PROGRAMS

SEC. 323. Section 621 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a) after "Sec. 621," and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Director shall give full effect to the intent of Congress that 'Upward Bound' programs, however described, shall be administered by the Commissioner of Education, and the Director shall not carry out or fund any program described in section 222(a) (5) (as in effect on June 30, 1969), or any comparable program, whether under the authority of that section or any other section of this Act, and whether or not carried on by or in a school, institution of higher education, penal or correctional institution, or any other agency or institution."

SEC. 324. Title VI of such Act is further amended by adding at the end of Part A the following new subsections:

"EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

"Sec. 622. (a) The Director shall—

"(1) at the time of entering into any contract or arrangement with nongovernmental organizations or individuals for the evaluation of programs or projects administered by him under this Act, or entering into any substantial modification of any existing such contract or arrangement, furnish to the Comptroller General of the United States a copy of the contract or modification thereof or a description of the arrangement or modification thereof, together with a statement of the bases upon which he considers the evaluation work involved and the estimated cost thereof justified, and upon which he has determined that it was necessary to contract or arrange with a nongovernmental organization or individual for its performance;

"(2) require each community action agency designated under section 201 of this Act, to advise him of each contract or arrangement entered into by it with nongovernmental organizations or individuals for

the evaluation of programs or projects administered by it under this Act, including information regarding the purpose, cost, scope, evaluation methodology, and organizations or individuals involved in such contract or arrangement; and

"(3) furnish to the Comptroller General of the United States at the end of each calendar quarter a listing of all contracts or arrangements reported to him in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection during such calendar quarter, including identification of the program or project, the organization or individual, and the cost involved in each contract or arrangement.

"(b) The Comptroller General shall conduct evaluations of programs carried out under this Act, and upon request by a committee of the Congress, or to the extent personnel are available, by Members of Congress shall (1) conduct studies of existing statutes and regulations governing programs carried on under this Act, (2) review the policies and practices of Federal agencies administering such programs, (3) review the evaluation procedures adopted by such agencies carrying out such programs, (4) initiate evaluation projects of particular programs, and (5) compile data necessary to carry out the preceding functions.

"(c) In carrying out the studies and evaluations herein authorized, the Comptroller General shall give particular attention to the practice of the Office of Economic Opportunity and of community action agencies designated under Section 201 of this Act of contracting with private firms, organizations and individuals for the provision of a wide range of studies and services (such as personnel recruitment and training, program evaluation, and program administration), and shall report to the Director and to the Congress his findings with respect to the necessity for such contracts and their effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this Act.

"(d) The Comptroller General or any of his duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to the financial assistance received by any agency under this Act.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of these sections.

"PREVENTION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

"Sec. 623. The Director shall issue regulations and take such other steps as may be necessary to assure that the Office of Economic Opportunity (or any other agency utilizing funds appropriated under the authority of this Act) shall not contract with, make a grant to, or enter into any other type of financial arrangement with, any individual who has been an officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity or any other agency of the executive branch of the United States Government which administers funds appropriated under the authority of this Act (or with a partner of such individual, or with a firm or business organization in which such individual holds a substantial financial interest or in which he serves as an officer), within one year after such employment, for any service or activity (other than reemployment as an officer or employee of a department or agency of the United States Government) in which such person participated personally and substantially as an officer or employee through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise.

"PAYMENT OF DUES PROHIBITED

"Sec. 624. No funds appropriated under the authority of this Act shall be used for or on behalf of any person, organization, or agency to make any payment in the nature of dues or membership fees in any public or private organization or association.

"NEPOTISM PROHIBITED

"Sec. 625. No person shall be employed (or continue in employment) with funds appropriated under the authority of this Act in a position (1) over which a member of his immediate family exercises supervisory authority, or (2) while he or a member of his immediate family serves on a board or committee which has authority to order personal actions affecting such position, or (3) while he or a member of his immediate family serves on a board or committee which, either by rule or practice, regularly nominates, recommends, or screens candidates for the agency or program in which such position is located. For the purposes of this section, a member of an immediate family shall include any of the following persons: husband, wife, father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter, uncle, aunt, niece, nephew, father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, son-in-law, or daughter-in-law."

PART C—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VIII ("VISTA")

RESTRUCTURING ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM

Sec. 331. Section 810(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out that part of the first sentence which precedes the numbered paragraphs and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The Director is authorized to make grants to State and local public agencies to recruit, select, train, and assign persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs. Such programs shall be those established by the grantee agency or (upon satisfactory assurance that the work of such volunteers will be supervised by competent individuals) by other public agencies or private nonprofit organizations, which involve the assignment of volunteers to work—"

ASSISTANCE IN LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

Sec. 332. Section 834 of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection, as follows:

"(f) Persons serving as volunteers under this title shall provide legal services or legal counsel only as a part of a legal services program (and at the request and under the supervision of the directors of such program) supported under section 222(a) (3) of this Act."

AUTHORIZATION OF NARCOTIC ADDICT RECOVERY PROGRAM

Sec. 504. Section 222(a) of such Act is further amended by adding to the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) A 'Narcotic Addict Recovery' program designed to discover and bring about post and/or preinstitutional treatment for narcotic addiction. Such a program shall be community based, with appropriate participation by parents, youth, educators and others in the community, serve the objectives of maintaining the family structure as well as the recovery of the individual addict, encourage the use of neighborhood facilities and the services of former addicts as program workers and facilitate the re-entry of addicts into society. Such a program shall also emphasize the coordination and full utilization of existing community services which pertain to the treatment of addiction and/or related disorders."

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the motion to recommit be dispensed with, and that it be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 163, nays 231, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

YEAS—163

Abernethy	Erlenborn	Mayne
Adair	Eshleman	Meskill
Andrews, Ala.	Fisher	Michel
Arends	Flowers	Miller, Ohio
Ayres	Flynt	Mizell
Baring	Ford, Gerald R.	Montgomery
Beall, Md.	Foreman	Myers
Belcher	Fountain	Nelsen
Bennett	Frey	Nichols
Betts	Fuqua	O'Neal, Ga.
Bevill	Galfianakis	Passman
Blackburn	Gettys	Pettis
Blanton	Gialmo	Poage
Bow	Goldwater	Poff
Bray	Gooding	Price, Tex.
Brinkley	Green, Ore.	Purcell
Brock	Griffin	Qule
Broomfield	Gross	Quillen
Brotzman	Grover	Randall
Broyhill, N.C.	Gubser	Rarick
Broyhill, Va.	Hagan	Reid, Ill.
Buchanan	Haley	Rhodes
Burke, Fla.	Hammer-	Rivers
Burleson, Tex.	schmidt	Roberts
Burton, Utah	Harsha	Rogers, Fla.
Bush	Hastings	Roth
Byrnes, Wis.	Henderson	Roudebush
Cabell	Hogan	Ruth
Caffery	Hull	Sandman
Camp	Hunt	Satterfield
Chamberlain	Hutchinson	Schadeberg
Chappell	Ichord	Scherle
Clancy	Jarman	Scott
Clausen,	Johnson, Pa.	Sikes
Don H.	Jonas	Smith, Calif.
Clawson, Del.	Jones, N.C.	Springer
Cleveland	King	Steiger, Ariz.
Collier	Kleppe	Stephens
Collins	Kuykendall	Stuckey
Colmer	Kyl	Talbot
Cramer	Landgrebe	Teague
Crane	Landrum	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	Langen	Teague, Tex.
Daniel, Va.	Latta	Thompson, Ga.
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	Lloyd	Ullman
Denney	Long, La.	Waggonner
Dennis	McClure	Wampler
Derwinski	McEwen	Whitten
Dickinson	McMillan	Wiggins
Dorn	Mann	Williams
Dowdy	Marsh	Wold
Downing	Martin	Wyman
Duncan	Mathias	Zion
Edwards, Ala.	May	Zwach

NAYS—231

Adams	Cohelan	Fraser
Addabbo	Conable	Frelinghuysen
Albert	Conte	Friedel
Alexander	Conyers	Fulton, Pa.
Anderson,	Corbett	Gallagher
Calif.	Corman	Garmatz
Anderson, Ill.	Coughlin	Gaydos
Andrews,	Culver	Gibbons
N. Dak.	Daddario	Gilbert
Annunzio	Daniels, N.J.	Gonzalez
Ashley	de la Garza	Gray
Aspinall	Delaney	Green, Pa.
Barrett	Dellenback	Griffiths
Biaggi	Dent	Gude
Blester	Diggs	Halpern
Bingham	Dingell	Hamilton
Boggs	Donohue	Hanley
Boland	Dulski	Hanna
Bolling	Dwyer	Hansen, Idaho
Brademas	Eckhardt	Hansen, Wash.
Brasco	Edmondson	Harrington
Brooks	Edwards, Calif.	Harvey
Brown, Mich.	Edwards, La.	Hathaway
Brown, Ohio	Eilberg	Hawkins
Burke, Mass.	Esch	Hays
Burlison, Mo.	Evans, Colo.	Hechler, W. Va.
Burton, Calif.	Evins, Tenn.	Heckler, Mass.
Button	Fallon	Helstoski
Byrne, Pa.	Farbstein	Hicks
Carey	Feighan	Horton
Carter	Findley	Howard
Casey	Fish	Hungate
Celler	Flood	Jacobs
Chisholm	Foley	Johnson, Calif.
Clark	Ford,	Jones, Ala.
Clay	William D.	Jones, Tenn.

Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Koch
Kyros
Leggett
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McFall
McKneally
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Meeds
Melcher
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.

Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Rallsback
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Riegler
Robison
Rodino
Roe
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schauer
Schwengel

Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Watts
Wecker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—39

Abbitt
Anderson,
Tenn.
Ashbrook
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Blatnik
Brown, Calif.
Cahill
Cederberg
Cowger
Dawson
Devine
Fascell

Fulton, Tenn.
Hall
Hébert
Hollifield
Hosmer
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Wilson, Bob
Winn

Reifel
Rostenkowski
Schneebell
Sebelius
Snyder
Utt
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Wilson, Bob
Winn

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hollifield against.
Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Schneebell against.
Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Pelly against.
Mr. Sebelius for, with Mr. Cahill against.
Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Blatnik against.
Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Fascell against.
Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.
Mr. Snyder for, with Mr. Cowger against.
Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
Mr. Lipscomb for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.
Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee against.
Mr. Ashbrook for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.
Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Van Deerlin against.
Mr. Reifel for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Mahon with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Whalley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-

BERT). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 276, nays 117, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—276

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson,
Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Biaggi
Blester
Bingham
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellberg
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Flood
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser

Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gallianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Hunt
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Koch
Kyl
Kyros
Langen
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Mann
Mathias
May
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher

Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Rallsback
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Riegler
Robison
Robison
Rodino
Roe
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Saylor
Schauer
Schwengel
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Wampler
Watts
Wecker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst

Widnall
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Wright

Wyatt
Wydler
Wyllie
Wyman
Yates

Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—117

Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ayres
Baring
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Blackburn
Bray
Brinkley
Brook
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson, Tex.
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Caffery
Camp
Chappell
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Cramer
Crane
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.

Erlenborn
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Foreman
Fountain
Frey
Fuqua
Gettys
Glaimo
Goldwater
Gooding
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Harsha
Henderson
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
McClure
McMillan
Marsh
Martin
Mayne

Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mize
Mizell
Montgomery
Myers
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Foff
Price, Tex.
Quile
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes
Rivers
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Ruth
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scott
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Steiger, Ariz.
Stuckey
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, Wis.
Waggoner
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams
Wold
Zion

NOT VOTING—40

Abbitt
Anderson,
Tenn.
Ashbrook
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Blatnik
Brown, Calif.
Cahill
Cederberg
Cowger
Dawson
Devine
Fascell

Fulton, Tenn.
Hall
Hastings
Hébert
Hollifield
Hosmer
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lipscomb
Mahon
Matsunaga
Minshall
Morton
Pelly

Powell
Reifel
Rostenkowski
Schneebell
Sebelius
Snyder
Utt
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Wilson, Bob
Winn

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following

pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Cowger for, with Mr. Snyder against.
Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Hall against.
Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Watson against.
Mr. Schneebell for, with Mr. Devine against.
Mr. Pell for, with Mr. Utt against.
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.
Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Berry against.
Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Reifel against.
Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Mahon.
Mr. Minshall with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. DICKINSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 734, the Committee on Education and Labor is discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 3016.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. PERKINS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3016 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12321, as passed, as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969".

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for which there are no separate authorizations of appropriations in such Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$1,563,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and such amount as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

SEC. 102. Sections 161, 245, 321, 408, 615, and 835 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are each amended by striking out "1967" and by inserting in lieu thereof "1969". Section 523 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years" and by inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1969, and the three succeeding fiscal years".

TITLE II—SPECIAL WORK AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. Title 1 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended redesignating part E as part F, by renumbering section 161 (as amended by section 102 of this Act) as section 171, and by inserting after part D the following new part:

"PART E—SPECIAL WORK AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 161. The Congress finds that the 'Operation Mainstream' program aimed primarily at the chronically unemployed and the 'New Careers' program providing jobs for the unemployed and low-income persons leading to broader career opportunities are uniquely effective; that, in addition to providing persons assisted with jobs, the key to their economic independence, these programs are of advantage to the community at large in that they are directed at community beautification and betterment and the improvement of health, education, welfare, public safety, and other public services; and that, while these programs are important and necessary components of comprehensive work and training programs, there is a need to encourage imaginative and innovative use of these programs, to enlarge the authority to operate them, and to increase the resources available for them.

"SPECIAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 162. (a) The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to stimulate and support efforts to provide the unemployed with jobs and the low-income worker with greater career opportunity. Programs authorized under this section shall include the following:

"(1) A special program to be known as 'Mainstream' which involves work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, physical condition, obsolete or inadequate skills, declining economic conditions, other causes of a lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employ-

ment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands, the rehabilitation of housing, the improvement of public facilities, and the improvement and expansion of health, education, day care, and recreation services;

"(2) A special program to be known as 'New Careers' which will provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields of public service, including without limitation health, education, welfare, recreation, day care, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for on-the-job training, promotion, and advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement.

"(b) The Director is authorized to provide financial and other assistance to insure the provision of supportive and follow-up services to supplement programs under this part including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individual to achieve success in these programs and in employment.

"ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

"SEC. 163. The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, availability of in-service training and technical assistance programs, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 164. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant; and

"(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development and upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high

concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

"(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

"PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 165. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

"(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

"EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 166. The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this part not more than 12½ per centum shall be used within any one State.

"LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 167. Programs assisted under this part shall be subject to the provisions of section 131 of this Act.

"AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 168. For the purpose of carrying out programs under this part, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and such amount as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

TITLE III—SPECIAL COMPREHENSIVE PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS AND PROGRAMS PROVIDING FOR INTENSIVE FOLLOW THROUGH EDUCATION FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

SEC. 301. (a) The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE IX—SPECIAL COMPREHENSIVE PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS AND PROGRAMS PROVIDING FOR INTENSIVE FOLLOW THROUGH EDUCATION FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 901. The Congress finds that children participating in Headstart projects and other preschool programs are afforded an increased opportunity for learning and healthy maturation, that more effective and maximum benefits accrue to children participating in preschool programs when special educational programs are provided for such children in the early primary grades immediately following their preschool participation, and that preschool and special educational programs and services provided in the early primary school years afford children with culturally deprived, educationally lacking, or economically distressed family backgrounds an essential opportunity to participate in the economic, social, and political mainstream

activities of American life. It is the purpose of Congress in this title to afford broad authority to the Director, either acting directly or by delegation pursuant to the provisions of title VI of this Act, to broaden the opportunities of the children described in this paragraph for preschool and early primary education, including provisions for parental and home involvement, utilizing to the maximum extent possible existing agencies and organizations and resources to accomplish such purposes.

"AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 902. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, the Director is authorized to make grants to community action agencies, local educational agencies, or other public or nonprofit agencies with the approval of the appropriate community action agency, or to a local educational agency or other public or nonprofit agency in an area where there is no community action agency. For the purpose of carrying out programs under this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$578,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and such amount as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

"ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 903. The sums which are appropriated or allocated for the purpose of making grants under this title shall be allotted pursuant to section 225 of this Act and such sums and project assistance shall be subject to the provisions of that section.

"USES OF FUNDS

"SEC. 904. (a) Grants made pursuant to this title may be used for (1) the continuation of programs authorized by sections 222 (a) (1) and (2) of this Act prior to the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969, and known as 'Project Head Start' and 'Follow Through', where consistent with the purposes of this title, (2) planning for and taking steps leading to the development of early childhood programs for the benefit of children with culturally deprived, educationally lacking or economically distressed family backgrounds, including appropriate arrangements with educational agencies for special educational programs and services for the further intensified provision of educational opportunities for such children during the early years of compulsory school attendance, (3) the provision within such programs of such comprehensive health, nutritional, social, and other services as the Director finds will assist such children in gaining their full potential, (4) providing for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the project operating level, (5) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of preschool and early primary school programs for the children described in this section, including the lease or rental of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment and supplies necessary to provide comprehensive programs as described in this section, (6) the provision of comprehensive physical and mental health services for children needing such assistance in order to profit from educational programs, (7) food and nutritional services, including family consultative and educational programs to improve nutrition in the home, (8) special social services to broaden the educational environment in the homes of the children participating in such programs, and (9) other social and educational activities, including summer, weekend, and vacation programs for such children which are deemed by the Director to further the purposes of this title."

Sec. 302. Section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking and paragraphs (1) and (2), thereof.

TITLE IV—INTENSIVE PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

SEC. 401. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE X—INTENSIVE PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 1001. Congress finds that existing programs aimed at providing surplus foods and free meals to needy children and families often are structured so as to have no or little impact on extremely economically disadvantaged children and families; that to reach the many victims of such impoverished circumstances, existing programs must be supplemented and broadened to produce effective results; that supplementary activities, requiring improved delivery services, increased family food subsidies, intensive family and child educational components, and emergency family medical services are required frequently in the homes of the most economically disadvantaged; and that such conditions operate most severely on the elderly and the very young. It is the purpose of this title to provide broad authority to meet such needs expeditiously.

"AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FOOD AND MEDICAL SERVICES AND SUPPLIES

"SEC. 1002. The Director is authorized to provide, directly or by delegation of authority pursuant to the provisions of title VI of this Act, financial assistance for the provision of such medical supplies and services, nutritional foodstuffs, and related services, as may be necessary to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. Such assistance may be provided by way of supplemental to such other assistance as may be extended under the provisions of other Federal programs, and may be used to extend and broaden such programs to serve extremely economically disadvantaged families with particular emphasis on the elderly and the extremely young where such services are not now provided and without regard to the requirements of such laws for local or State administration or financial participation. In extending such assistance, the Director may make grants to community action agencies or local public or private nonprofit organizations or agencies to carry out the purposes of this title. The Director is authorized to carry out the functions under this title through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in a manner that will insure the availability of such foodstuffs, medical services and supplies through a community action agency where feasible, or other agencies or organizations if no such agency exists or is able to administer programs to provide such foodstuffs, medical services, and supplies to needy individuals and families.

"AREAS OF SPECIAL EMPHASIS

"SEC. 1003. The Director shall take steps to assure that programs under this title shall be designed to deal particularly with the incidence of malnutrition, hunger and serious medical needs among persons in economically disadvantaged circumstances who are fifty-five years of age and older and young children. In the conduct of such programs, the Director shall encourage the employment of such elderly persons as regular, part-time, and short-terms staff in programs designed to carry out the provisions of this title.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 1004. For the purpose of carrying out programs under this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$92,000,000 for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and such amount as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

SEC. 402. Section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

AMENDMENT OF RURAL LOAN PROGRAM

SEC. 501. Section 302(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "such families, and" and inserting "such families, or".

LIMITATION ON LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

SEC. 502. Section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "counseling, education, and other appropriate services" and inserting in lieu thereof "legal counseling, education in legal matters, and other appropriate legal services".

AVAILABILITY OF LEGAL SERVICES TO ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

SEC. 503. Section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Members of the Armed Forces, and members of their immediate families, shall be eligible to obtain legal services under such programs in cases of extreme hardship (determined in accordance with regulations of the Director issued after consultation with the Secretary of Defense). The costs of providing such services shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of Defense."

APPLICABILITY TO TRUST TERRITORY

SEC. 504. Section 609(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and title II" and inserting ", title II, title III-A, and title IV".

AUTHORIZATION OF NARCOTIC ADDICT RECOVERY PROGRAM

SEC. 505. Section 222(a) of such Act is further amended by adding to the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) A 'Narcotic Addict Recovery' program designed to discover and bring about post and/or preinstitutional treatment for narcotic addiction. Such a program shall be community based, with appropriate participation by parents, youth, educators, and others in the community, serve the objective of maintaining the family structure as well as the recovery of the individual addict, encourage the use of neighborhood facilities and the services of former addicts as program workers and facilitate the re-entry of addicts into society. Such a program shall also emphasize the coordination and full utilization of existing community services which pertain to the treatment of addiction and/or related disorders."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12321) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 3016, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3016) to provide for the continuation of pro-

grams authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, and for other purposes, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Messrs. PUCINSKI, BRADEMAS, O'HARA, CAREY, HAWKINS, WILLIAM D. FORD, HATHAWAY, MEEDS, Mrs. MINK, Messrs. CLAY, AYRES, QUIE, REID of New York, ERLBORN, SCHERLE, DELLENBACK, ESCH, and STEIGER of Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and to include extraneous material.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14580. An act to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 14580) entitled "An act to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic, economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CASE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14580

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14580) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic, economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, HAYS, FASCELL, ADAIR, MAILLIARD, and FRELINGHUYSEN.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE REPORTS ON S. 2910 AND H.R. 12795

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills S. 2910 and H.R. 12795.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority whip yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority whip, we have finished the program for this week, and we will ask to go over until Monday upon the announcement of the program for next week.

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There are 22 suspensions, the first of which is H.R. 15095—Social Security Amendments of 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert the remainder of the suspensions in the RECORD at this point.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would it be the plan of the distinguished majority leader to call these bills up in the order in which they are listed?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would say, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa that that would be up to the discretion of the Speaker. I would say generally, yes, but I would not want to bind either those calling up the bills or the Chair.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that he does not intend to depart from the order on the list unless there is some extraordinary situation.

Does that answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The suspensions are as follows:

1. H.R. 15095—Social Security Amendments of 1969;
2. H.R. 14646—To grant the consent of Congress to the Connecticut-New York Railroad Passenger Transportation Compact;
3. H.R. 10124. To extend the time for filing tort actions by certain persons;
4. H. Res. 661—Commending the American serviceman and veteran of Vietnam for his efforts and sacrifices;
5. H. Con. Res. 454—Calling for the humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front;
6. H.R. 14789—Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1969;
7. S.J. Res. 90—To enable the U.S. to hold a conference to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty;
8. H.R. 15166—River Basin Monetary Authorization Act of 1969;
9. H.R. 14464—To insure that certain facilities are accessible to the physically handicapped;
10. S. 3169—To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954;
11. S. 740—To establish the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People;
12. H.J. Res. 757—To authorize appropriations for the Office of Intergovernmental Relations;
13. H.J. Res. 506—Consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas;
14. H.R. 14086—Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1969;
15. H.R. 14790—To extend the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health;
16. H.R. 14733—To extend the program of health services for domestic migrant agricultural workers;
17. H.R. 14289—To place the counties of El Paso and Hudspeth, Texas, in the mountain standard time zone;
18. H.R. 13448—To authorize the exchange of lands at New Orleans, La.;
19. H.R. 13630—To extend certain expiring provisions of law relating to vocational education;
20. H.R. 6971—Vessel Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone Act;
21. H.R. 9366—To change the number of apprentices authorized to be employees of the Government Printing Office; and
22. H.R. 14213—To provide for additional Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday is Private Calendar day, and the following bills may be called up by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, these are all from the Committee on Armed Services, and I would ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The bills referred to are as follows:

- H.R. 8022—To authorize allowances to certain members of the uniformed services for dependents' schooling;
- H.R. 8021—To authorize allowances under certain circumstances;
- H.R. 386—To provide a family separation allowance in certain instances; and
- H.R. 110—Relating to family separation allowances paid to members of the uniformed services.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, for Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 15091, to lower interest rates and fight inflation, to help housing, small

business, and employment, and for other purposes, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 9476, to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 14944, to authorize an adequate force for the protection of the Executive Mansion and foreign embassies and for other purposes, also subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later. Of course, we expect to have several conference reports—we hope to, anyway.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, does the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma have any hope at all that the Senate might finish the appropriation bills next week, and we can act on the conference reports?

Mr. ALBERT. I certainly have hopes. I would hate to lose hope.

Mr. ARENDS. That would certainly be my hope.

I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE HIGH INTEREST RATE, TIGHT MONEY POLICIES

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said about how the high interest rate and tight money policies have failed in terms of meeting inflation, I believe a few words ought to be said about the positive performance of this high interest, tight money.

We are looking into 1970, and I believe we can see that the continuation of the performance of present policy will mean less money for schools all over the United States.

This policy is going to mean less money for States which have programs, like my

own State, for developing water interests of the States.

It means less money for cities to do all the things cities must do to undergird the building of the cities. Projects depending upon bonds, such as roads, flood control, water and sewer lines, and government buildings are all now completely frustrated.

This policy also has brought selective unemployment; 17 percent for those who are in minority races, 22 percent for some of the young people.

This policy also has created almost a depression in the building industry.

This policy has put small businessmen out of business and bounced them completely off the borrowing benches of all the banks of America.

So when we say what the policy has not been able to accomplish, let us think of the things that have been accomplished by this policy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently it has been decided that we cannot spend billions on foreign aid and still have them to spend in this country. I do not know how the gentleman voted on the foreign giveaway bill, but somewhere cuts apparently have to be made.

Mr. HANNA. I am glad that the gentleman spoke about the foreign giveaway bill. I remember that one of his cohorts—and I believe he probably agreed with it—talked about a giveaway and how it affected the United States.

I remind the gentleman that when the foreign aid bill was carrying as much as \$6 billion the United States never had it so good. We had the greatest growth of the United States after World War II until 1965 the country had ever seen. That is when we had the best foreign aid program we had ever seen.

Mr. GROSS. When we were in debt over our ears.

THE PLIGHT OF THE SHOE INDUSTRY

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I reported the closing down of the Victory Shoe Co. at Avon, Mass. Today I want to report another closing that is taking place in Massachusetts in the footwear industry. The B. F. Goodrich Plant at Watertown, which in 1964 employed up to 5,000 persons, expects to have the firm close down by December 19. My distinguished and esteemed colleague who represents that district, the Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, charged the day before yesterday that cheap foreign imports were responsible for the scheduled closing of the B. F. Goodrich Plant at Watertown.

Mr. Speaker, the town of Watertown alone is losing \$500,000 a year in real estate taxes from this firm. Five thousand people were employed by it in 1964 and

at the end of this year it will be down to zero.

Mr. Speaker, what do we have to do in this country to wake the people up? Here is an industry that is being destroyed systematically in every section of the country. There are 253 Members of this House who have footwear firms located in their districts. Most of these firms are the economic backbone of small local communities.

Before this year is out I will have brought to the attention of this House several other footwear firms that will close their doors.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the meeting which we had with President Nixon on September 23 will start to result in bringing forth results. So far all we have heard is the forked tongue of the administration. On one side one says he is going to resist cheap labor footwear imports, and on the other hand we have negotiators pushing for more free trade. They call these people "free traders." My assessment of them is that they are not free traders but they are freeloaders.

An article from the Boston Herald of Thursday, December 11, 1969, follows:

TOWN SEEKS BUYERS FOR GOODRICH

U.S. Rep. Philip J. Philbin charged yesterday that "cheap foreign imports" were responsible for the scheduled closing of the B. F. Goodrich plant in Watertown.

Earlier, plant officials announced that some 950 rubber products workers would be dropped by Dec. 19 in a near-final phasing out of the installation.

Some 150 office and warehouse employees will continue to work a few more months, officials said, while the plant is being totally shut down.

B. F. Goodrich manufactured waterproof rubber footwear and flooring at its Watertown facility and, in 1964, employed up to 5000 workers.

With payments of some \$500,000 annually, it was Watertown's largest single source of tax revenue.

Town officials have been scouting possible buyers of the 64-acre site since Goodrich officials reported in 1966 they were starting to phase out operations at the plant.

UNDERMINING THE CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a familiar coalition, a not so silent majority of the House, delivered a devastating blow to the cause of civil rights by rejecting a simple extension of the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

After a decade of progress in civil rights under President Kennedy and President Johnson, a decade in which the Congress met its responsibility by enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the act of 1968, we have entered a period of retrogression. It started immediately when the Nixon administration took office. Defense contracts were awarded to contractors in violation of the Executive order on discrimination in employment. HEW guidelines on school desegregation were abandoned. The Attorney

General appeared before the Supreme Court in opposition to the NAACP on the question of implementing the desegregation decision of 1954. And the Attorney General said that, if the Supreme Court did order immediate desegregation in Mississippi, he would be unable to enforce the order.

The Supreme Court did order immediate action, and apparently the Attorney General is fulfilling his own prophecy.

The latest revelation of the administration's retreat on civil rights was reported in today's Washington Post. The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice is already demoralized, but now it is to be dismembered. The responsibility of the Civil Rights Division to enforce school desegregation cases is to be shifted to local U.S. attorneys. All of the work which has been done by Burke Marshall, John Doar, and Stephen Pollak will go down the drain if this is permitted. The fox will truly be in the chicken coop.

Mr. Speaker, if any agency of the Federal Government has been doing its part in preventing the polarization of our society, of which the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders warned, it has been the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, 1969 has been a year of retreat. I call upon the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House to begin an immediate investigation into the way in which the Civil Rights Division is being demoralized and undermined.

DANGEROUS EFFECT OF THE IMPORT FLOOD

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a Member of this Congress talk about some results of the import damage. I might bring the Members up to date a little on something that might interest them.

We are taking up the Office of Economic Opportunity bill today, and I see where there has been a contract let to train 60 unemployed workers into skilled jobs, and the contract amounts to \$2,243,000, which is something like \$45,000 per man.

There are 650 workers who have just been let out of the glass plant in my community, and they are going to ask for training. Also there are 500 steel workers who have just been let out, and who have now been approved for training, with a payment of \$2,232,000 under the import injury clause of the Kennedy round.

Further, we have found out through the figures received from the Department of Commerce that 51 percent of all ladies' handbags in this country are now imported, and that many of the New Jersey plants making handbags have been closed down because when they went out to secure their Christmas orders they found that all of the storerooms of the retail outlets were filled with imported handbags, and now they have a great number of handbags that were made during the

off season to keep people working during the lean months.

Mr. Speaker, they say there is something like reciprocity. Maybe we can get some foreigners to buy our handbags.

Mr. Speaker, I advise the House right now, unless we do something quickly in the matter of the flooding of imports into this country from low-wage countries, we are going to face a crisis that all of the OEO bills you could put together will never be able to stave off the poverty in this Nation.

NORTH APOLOGIZES TO SOUTH; OTHER PAPERS PLEASE COPY

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, one of the few times in the history of mankind, a major newspaper has apologized to an entire section of the country for their former editorial policy and begged its forgiveness for having distorted and slanted the news and falsely lambasted the South.

It takes guts, Mr. Speaker, for an individual to do this. It takes infinitely more for a newspaper to publish its apology for the whole world to see and I take my hat off to the editor and take it upon myself, as a southerner, to accept the apology and say we forgive you for what you did to us.

The newspaper is the Chicago Tribune and I now believe it has earned the description WGN, "world's greatest newspaper" which has been its trademark over the years. The editorial in question was commented upon by the Shreveport Times in an editorial on December 9 and I take pleasure in inserting it here in the RECORD for my contemporaries and the historians who will follow after us all.

There are other papers far more guilty than the Trib, but I doubt if there is any now willing to make a similar apology. I offer them the opportunity by adding the customary line: "Northern newspapers please copy." If any do, I will be pleased to see that they, too, are printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

AN APOLOGY TO THE SOUTH

The Chicago Tribune calls itself "the world's greatest newspaper" and uses the letters "WGN" as abbreviation for the designation. Years ago, by permission of the Federal Communications Commission, it was allowed to use the letters for its radio station and this permission was repeated later for its TV station.

As a publishing institution, the Tribune doubtless deserves the descriptive adjective "great" and some—perhaps partisans—would even sanction "greatest," but others would raise questions, rightfully. The Trib, as Chicagoans call it, owns newsprint plants and other interests. It will, it has been said, send a star reporter to Timbuktu to look into reports of invention of a new kind of match.

At the turn into the 1920s, The Trib sent its highest paid reporter, Phillip Kinsley, to spend three months in Australia and to write articles about that nation—holding that Australia, little known to the world generally at that time, had a greater future than any piece of land its size on earth. It was two to three decades before the forecast began to come true, but The Trib was about right.

The late Capt. Joseph Medill Patterson, its editor at that time, said half the subscribers to The Trib read it to cuss it and half because they liked it. He once instituted a contest, paying \$100 a day for the best letter condemning The Trib as the world's worst newspaper and \$100 for the best letter contending it was the world's greatest—and published both letters daily for several weeks on page one.

And, for decades, The Trib lambasted the South, falsely—perhaps truthfully once in a while, but rarely. It seemed like The Trib felt its editorial page any day was a failure without an anti-South editorial.

But, now, The Trib apologizes to the South for The Trib's own past. It did so in the following editorial a few weeks ago:

"A SINCERE APOLOGY TO THE SOUTH

"DEAR DIXIE: Can you possibly find it in your heart to accept our sincere apology?"

"When there was race rioting in Little Rock, Ark., we were convinced that the cause was callousness. Our public officials and our press in Chicago insisted that the only reasons for Negro restiveness were your segregated schools and your stubborn governor. We in Chicago with integrated schools and a very liberal governor are now writhing with agony of race rioting. And as we seek to set our house in order, we hope your headlines will be kinder to us than ours were to you.

"And when a Mississippi Negro boy was found drowning, we in Chicago called this the inevitable result of a white supremacy tradition. Now a Negro girl, 14 and pregnant, has been shot to death on the front porch of her own home in Chicago—and we are confused and ashamed—and frightened.

"What are we doing wrong that has made eight square miles of our city a battleground? Help us, if you can find it in your own heart to help.

"And Alabama, when your state police were photographed subduing rioters with night sticks, Chicago bold face front pages condemned you for indefensible brutality. Now Illinois state police have resorted to armored cars and cracking skulls and shooting to kill.

"Your governor has alleged that 'Communists are fomenting this strife.' We scoffed.

"Now 13 Negroes on Chicago's west side have been charged with plotting treason. We are sweeping admittedly Communist literature from our littered streets. Forgive us for not knowing what we are talking about.

"Georgia, when you were photographed in the act of turning back crowds of marching children—we could not control ourselves. The very idea, the Chicago press editorialized, that youngsters should be considered a menace sufficient to justify the use of tear gas.

"Now in our own asphalt jungle, we have seen Negro youngsters of 9, 10 and 11 years advance on police with drawn guns or broken bottles—screaming kill Whitey!

"And we used gas and clubs and dogs and guns and God forgive us, what else could we do? Can you, Georgia, forgive us, too?"

"We tried the patience we had preached—honest we did. We tried so desperately that seven policemen were shot the other night, two of them through the back. So, in the end, we resorted to methods more brutal than yours. But, don't you see, we had to.

"Dear Dixie, perhaps we have not yet learned to appreciate what you have been trying to do to defeat revolution—but for whatever belated comfort it may be, from our glass house we will not be throwing any more stones.

ROGERS EXPRESSES CONCERN OVER CONTENTS OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVES

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Safety of Drugs in Great Britain, otherwise known as the Dunlop Committee, yesterday reported in London, that oral contraceptives containing relatively large amounts of the hormone "estrogen" increase the risk of dangerous blood clots among women taking them.

The Dunlop Committee urged manufacturers to withdraw 21 of 30 brands on the British market because they contain 75 micrograms or more of the hormone. The Committee recommended that oral contraceptive pills not contain more than 50 micrograms.

Mr. Speaker, while 1.5 million British women take the pill, there are 8.5 million American women who do.

Moreover, it is my understanding that at least four U.S. manufacturers of the pill are involved in the production of some of the 21 brands of which the Dunlop Committee urged removal from the market.

Furthermore, there are 37 different oral contraceptive products on the market in the United States and at least 30 of these contain more than 50 micrograms of either "mestranol" or "ethynil estradiol," the two principal estrogens used in the oral contraceptives.

In light of this report of the British committee, I urge the Food and Drug Administration to carefully review the oral contraceptive compounds on the market in the country to determine if the estrogen level is dangerous to the health of American women who are using the pill.

Along these lines, I will be most interested in finding out how FDA, under the new reorganization, plans to handle this matter and other scientific judgments on new drugs, pesticides and foods.

I think the reorganization announced by the Secretary should help greatly in increasing the efficiency of the FDA and that in turn will help protect the consumer.

This move to reorganize FDA is approximately along the lines of what I requested in October and I am pleased that the Secretary has taken such action.

The entire operation at FDA seemed shaky and the lines of communication were very limited. I hope giving FDA direct access to the Assistant Secretary for Health will open those lines of communication. Certainly, the MSG and cyclamate controversies have pointed out the need for communication.

I hope that we will see FDA take on a more aggressive character and will become, as I have said, the lead agency for consumer protection within the Federal Government.

POLITICS AS USUAL

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) spoke briefly about President Nixon's "threat" to veto the tax reform bill if it contains both the Senate-

adopted \$800 exemption and the 15-percent social security increase.

Again yesterday Mr. MADDEN broadened his attack, apparently as a spokesman for what he called the Democrat steering committee, in an obviously political attempt to play on the emotions of our retired people and other voting taxpayers.

I cannot let these politically inspired groans of anguish go by without answering, although this is typical of the methods used by some of my liberal friends to garner votes. It is very easy to engage in a popularity contest by promising the people to give them more money and bigger tax exemptions—it is easy so long as you do not face up to the problem about who will pick up the check for these big spenders.

One of the reasons there is a demand today for bigger exemptions and larger social security payments is that my liberal colleagues, including Mr. MADDEN, have for years shown a total lack of capacity to resist demonstrating their great generosity with somebody else's money. It is their votes for deficit spending, it is their disregarding the basic laws of economics, it is their carrot-on-the-stick technique of attracting votes with big spending programs that have, in fact, eroded the value of the dollar to the point where everyone suffers, including those on social security.

Mr. Speaker, all of us recognize the need to care for those who are unable to care for themselves; all of us also recognize that the average workingman is overburdened with taxes imposed largely by liberals to pay for their liberal social welfare schemes. In the last 5 years \$100 has become worth \$75, and a \$600 exemption is really only a \$450 exemption. We can thank the gentleman from Indiana and those who share the sympathy of the Democrat steering committee for the situation.

Today we have a President who wants to restore a sound dollar in order that every American can enjoy the fruits of his labor, but the gentleman from Indiana says "No: we will give away more and more cheaper dollars, and if you disagree you are against the poor." This, obviously, is the old shell game, but the American people will not be hoodwinked by such gyrations. Certainly it makes no sense to the President, and fortunately, all the name calling by the gentleman from Indiana is not going to change his mind if the Congress does send such a package to the White House. President Nixon is determined to end inflation.

Testimony by Treasury officials before the Ways and Means Committee revealed that for each \$100 the exemption to the taxpayer is raised, revenues are reduced nearly \$3 billion. How in the world the gentleman from Indiana and his Democrat steering group expect to pay for all their excesses and deficits which they created by voting for every conceivable type of big spending program, escapes me and I dare say most thinking Members of this Congress. This country will never return to a sound dollar basis as long as the Congress, which incidentally has been controlled by Democrats for 34 out of the last 38

years, continues to spend more of the taxpayers' money without having the courage to enact appropriate measures to collect the money to pay for the programs. I trust the conferees on the tax reform bill will make a major effort to clean it up and resolve the over 150 differences, thus sending a tax reform bill to the President that is indeed a tax reform bill rather than a Christmas tree.

TRAVEL RESTRICTION LEGISLATION

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the first contingent of "volunteers" to assist the Cuban Government harvest its 1970 sugar crop has just left from Mexico. Reports state that 90 young Americans left the United States via Mexico on November 30. They are the first of seven groups totaling 600 which will spend 2 months in Cuba harvesting sugar for Castro's Communist government. They left without passports in order to avoid prosecution.

The Venceremos Brigade, as it is known, has, thus, passed the recruitment stage and is now actively engaged in undercutting American foreign policy. For those who doubt this proposition, a recent Cuban radio broadcast made the following observation on the expedition:

They will come to cut cane with us here, as an expression of solidarity with the Cuban people. This is a friendly gesture which we appreciate very much, for this year's harvest is, historically, the largest of them all and it represents a decisive battle of our people in the general struggle against underdevelopment.

The Cuban Government made numerous other press releases and radio statements regarding the support being given to Castro.

Thus, the most self-defeating aspect of the SDS-sponsored expedition is its furnishing the Cuban and Latin American Communists with propaganda ammunition. The real purpose of the SDS in sending the young radicals to Cuba is not to cut cane, but to make Cuban propaganda hay. In fact, the SDS played down the cane-cutting aspect of the expedition when they explained its purpose last summer:

We wish to educate people about the international revolution against imperialism, to gain practical understanding of communist principles, and to give support to the Cuban Government.

It is too bad that they are not going to cut cane in earnest as canecutting is hard work and the experience would, no doubt, be educational for many of them. Moreover, their so-called idealism will, no doubt, soon give way to despair when they get a firsthand view of "Communist principles in action." On December 1, Andrew Ferrell, a former Black Panther aide to Eldrige Cleaver who just left Cuba in disgust, stated in part, when he arrived in Paris:

The Cubans were faking on the world, especially on the revolutionaries and progressive people in the States, to keep their

international support strong . . . We ran into all kinds of dissatisfied Cubans. You know, like people were saying "Hey man, you're crazy. What did you come down here for? Everybody is leaving here and going there (America)". This is insane.

With regard to the actual harvesting of the sugar crop, it should be noted that it is considered critical both for the economy of the country and for the survival of Castro's regime. Although it is doubtful that the canecutters will actually cut much cane, it is absurd to permit such a large group of Americans to lend assistance to the harvesting just when our embargo on trade with Cuba is beginning to achieve the desired result of placing such a burden on the Cuban economy that it is incapable of exporting Communist revolution elsewhere in Latin America.

On November 20, I introduced H.R. 14893 and 14894 which were cosponsored by 34 other Congressmen to prevent such flagrant violation of restrictions placed on travel abroad by the Secretary of State for foreign policy reasons. This legislation is designed to give the Secretary of State the statutory authority, which recent Supreme Court cases say he lacks, to impose and enforce area restrictions on travel. It gives the Secretary of State the power to restrict travel if he determines that the country or area is first, at war; second, one where insurrection or armed hostilities are in progress; third, one whose military forces are engaged in armed conflict with U.S. forces; and fourth, one to which travel must be restricted in the national interest because such travel would seriously impair the conduct of U.S. foreign policy.

If enacted, this legislation will effectively prohibit those who desire to travel to restricted areas and engage in activities that undercut this Nation's foreign policy objectives and, actually, encourage our adversaries. The cane-cutting expedition is a dramatic illustration of the need for this legislation. However, since the recent Supreme Court cases held that the Secretary of State lacked the authority to impose travel restrictions, there have been many other instances of American radicals engaging in activities in restricted countries which undermine the effective conduct of American foreign policy.

For example, Stokely Carmichael in August of 1967, shortly after the Laub decisions denying the enforceability of travel restrictions was handed down, while in Hanoi investigating "savage U.S. aggression" against North Vietnam, stated on Hanoi radio that he "pledged the support of American Negroes for Communist North Vietnam in the Vietnamese war." While in Havana the week before, he called for "total revolution" against the "imperialist, capitalist, and racist structure of the United States." In August of this year an American antiwar delegation comprised of SDS's leaders, black antiwar leaders, and other militants toured North Vietnam and held a mass rally on August 4 at which time they made speeches condemning the United States, praising the North Vietnamese, and calling for solidarity be-

tween the antiwar factions in the United States and North Vietnam.

In September of this year, Elridge Cleaver, head of the Black Panthers, appeared with a delegation of Black Panthers in Pyongyang, capital of North Korea, at the World Conference of Journalists Against U.S. Imperialism and said in part:

U.S. imperialism seeks to turn the entire world into a huge prison under its bloody thumb and under the boots of its troops and puppets. The people of the world must unite and stage a massive, universal prison break against U.S. imperialism.

Most recently, Richard Barnett, who served in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency during the Kennedy administration and who is now codirector of the Institute for Policy Studies with Marcus Raskin, and William Meyers, a director of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam, traveled to Hanoi to meet with Hanoi officials and called for support of massive American demonstrations against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

Many of these individuals and groups who have traveled to restricted countries have deliberately misrepresented American opinion and offered the assistance and cooperation of American organizations to promote the views of our adversaries. I am of the opinion that one of the most important reasons for the intransigence of the North Vietnamese in the Paris negotiations is the blurred picture of the American electorate which has been painted by the fringe minority who have traveled to Hanoi in deliberate violation of the restrictions imposed by the Secretary of State. The Governments of North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba, and China have made much propaganda out of these visits and offers of assistance. A case in point is the recent buildup that was given to the release of a partial prisoner-of-war list to the antiwar group who met with the North Vietnamese in Paris without consultation with the U.S. Government and in complete disregard of the emissaries appointed by our elected officials. A recently returned POW, Lt. Robert F. Frishman, stated he did not want to be used for propaganda purposes and that the peace groups should not be permitted to travel to Hanoi.

In addition, some have actually engaged in sending supplies and economic aid to our adversaries. The Quaker ship, the *Phoenix*, has made numerous trips in defiance of travel restrictions to deliver medical and other needed supplies to North Vietnam to enable them to carry on their war of aggression against Americans in South Vietnam.

These are but a few of the many recent instances of Americans who have traveled to restricted countries which have been and are carrying on staunch anti-American and anti-free-world policies, including aggression, and have offered their support and confer with them as to how to gain more American support for their anti-American policies. The illogic and undermining character of this activity is readily apparent. Chairman CELLER of the Judiciary Committee has called for departmental re-

ports on H.R. 14893. My colleagues, Congressman McCULLOCH, the ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, and Congressman ZABLOCKI, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Affairs Committee, have either cosponsored this bill or introduced their own. Consequently, I am hopeful that hearings can be held on this matter as soon as possible in order to return to the Secretary of State the power which he formerly had before the situation grows worse.

THE PROBLEMS OF DRUGS IN THE SIXTH DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

(Mr. ZWACH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, throughout our Nation, the drug problem has increased rapidly. I am concerned with this situation; concerned enough to meet with the city and county law enforcement officials of my district to discuss this growing problem and the experiences and problems of the law enforcement officials in dealing with it.

On Friday, November 28, 1969, at the Kandiyohi County Courthouse in Willmar, Minn., I became aware of how serious the drug situation is in the Sixth District of Minnesota. Please understand, Mr. Speaker, my district is not a metropolitan district, but a rural one.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that there is a serious and growing drug problem in countryside America, and I think my colleagues should be aware of it.

The local law enforcement officials I met with are doing the best possible job they can to stop this growing problem. But they are hampered due to the lack of money, manpower, and enough education on the problem, to adequately handle the problem.

Youngsters 15 and 16 years old are now using marijuana, speed, and LSD. One 16-year-old has been selling marijuana. Students are selling LSD in high school. It is the same story with students in college. These are just a few examples of the problems confronting our society more rapidly than we care to admit.

For members of the law-enforcement agencies, the big problem, in addition to drug use itself, is manpower and funds. They just do not have enough of each to handle the job they want to do. Even though their resources are low, these law-enforcement officials are speaking before all groups regarding the problem of drugs. They are working with the schools in developing successful drug education programs. They are doing, in my estimation, the best job possible with few tools available.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues may know the result of my meeting with law-enforcement officials on the problem of drugs, I conclude my remarks by giving a short consensus of the meeting.

There is a drug problem in the Sixth District of Minnesota and it is growing. There is a lack of money and manpower, at local, State, and Federal levels, to adequately handle a problem that is

growing rapidly. There is a need for better rehabilitation of addicts, as it is felt the present method is not doing the job. There is no question but that the laws regarding narcotics need a thorough study and revision—especially in regard to possession and pushers. Student and adult educational programs have been initiated in some areas with success—there is a need for more such programs. There is a need for more assistance to local law-enforcement officials, for more publications and films on drugs.

Most important, there is a need for all of us to become aware of a growing and dangerous problem.

IS PUBLIC OFFICE BECOMING UNTENABLE?

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of the open society is the relative absence of control over individual conduct. This is a great privilege and one that should be highly prized.

In order to be most effective, however, this privilege must be exercised with restraint. Although the individual has the right of dissent, he has no obligation to do so. Unfortunately, today many of our fellow citizens feel that it is incumbent upon them to demonstrate and to create confrontations as a primary matter. Either they do not realize or they do not care that continued turmoil and strife may well result in curtailing or abolishing the very freedoms that they misuse.

One of the results of this irrational conduct is to drive effective public servants from their jobs, whether they be as chief executives of our municipalities or presidents of our universities.

How would you like to serve as mayor of New York or as president of MIT?

By a strange coincidence the distinguished columnist, Alan Olmstead, the Connecticut Yankee, and I became concerned about this problem at the same time. Mr. Olmstead's column in the Waterbury, Conn., Republican of December 6, 1969, discusses this serious problem in a very effective and understanding manner.

Interestingly and ironically, at the very time that I was making my talk, which excluded Danbury from this problem, unknown to me and outside the restaurant where I was speaking militants were struggling with police in their attempt to disrupt the gathering which had been organized to honor the mayor of Danbury.

Columnist Olmstead captioned his column "Public Office Is Becoming Untenable." I include the text of the column which generously quotes Dr. Homer Babbidge, the highly qualified president of the University of Connecticut, who incidentally was drafted to Connecticut from the U.S. Office of Education:

PUBLIC OFFICE IS BECOMING UNTENABLE (By Alan Olmstead)

One of Connecticut's college presidents discussing the currently rapid turnover in college presidents recently broadened his theme to include the question of leadership

in "the larger society" which includes the political and public as well as the academic world.

"What is happening on your campuses by way of testing an established order and by way of effecting change is only a precursor of what is in store for the larger society" said Homer D. Babbidge, of the University of Connecticut, down at the fall convocation of the Yale Alumni Board.

"What is at stake," said Pres. Babbidge, "is not the incumbents. They are obviously expendable. The real question is, who will be willing to succeed them?"

"And if I am right, the far greater question is, who will be willing to accede to any position of leadership in a society that on the one hand expects George to do it, and on the other is bent on spilling George's blood?"

We quote Pres. Babbidge's philosophical realism not to help him defend the academic bailiwick, which he does well enough by himself, but to share his concern for the brutality—our word, not his—with which present day society seems to try to make offices of public responsibility "untenable"—Babbidge's word.

Connecticut public life is currently being compelled to focus its attention on one such example of a post—that of Commissioner of Public Welfare—being made "untenable" with the result that one commissioner, who might be regarded as "expendable," has moved out of it, moving the attention of the governor and the people up to the next question, that of "who will be willing to succeed." The temporary trouble seems to be that there is nobody particularly willing to move himself into the meatgrinder a rather, a rather berserk and violent and irresponsible legislative sadism has made of this particular office.

Gov. Dempsey obviously has some sympathetic understanding of what has just happened to a welfare commissioner and what frightens off potential successor commissioners because the governor himself has just been passing through a phase of his career in which he himself was subjected to senseless abuse, as if neither he nor his office were considered entitled to the respect and civil tongue of even his own political party.

But Pres. Babbidge's concern obviously did not halt with such potential Connecticut examples of the rough treatment given leadership. The public and its whip go seeking their boy in the White House, or on the Supreme Court bench, until it is indeed something of a miracle that some are tough enough to survive, others tough enough to want to move forward into the hot spots.

To be a successful and durable public official these days it is not enough to be tough, and it is not enough to be right, either, and not enough to be both tough and right together. An added ingredient is needed, which we would call something in the category of style—some quality of roundness, perhaps, which baffles enemies looking for some kind of grip or leverage.

While Mr. Olmstead's column was being distributed I was discussing exactly the same problem in Danbury, in part as follows:

First let me say that the demands made upon local administration, mayors and first selectmen, of our cities and towns are staggering. In too many cases in this decade of demonstration and dissent, our people take the attitude that mayors are expendable, that they are put up to knock down, and it is certainly significant and worthy of pondering that in many instances mayors of major cities—there are five recently—have seen fit to retire from the arena—even though they undoubtedly would have been

reelected—because they could no longer stand the miseries of office in today's climate.

The decade of dissent has seen demonstrations over Vietnam, the draft, taxes, environmental control, law and order, voting rights, civil rights, crime in the streets, and inflation—and yet at the same time, it has been a decade of accomplishment—a decade of full employment and of social progress, of expansion of employment opportunities and civil rights. It has also been a decade of riots and strife on college campuses. A review of the problems of the past decade makes it painfully clear that this is not a time for wishful thinking or appeasement. I suggest, however, that it is a time for restraint in every area of public action, and, particularly, with reference to our fiscal programs.

It is a reason for questioning, as we face up to our major problems, that elected officials are too often automatically looked upon as culprits or loaded with abuse while they not only are faced with the problems of carrying their difficult daily tasks, but also of coping with the continuing and the frustrating techniques of confrontations and discord.

It is indeed unfortunate that captious criticism is not only perpetrated but encouraged. To those who stimulate this criticism, I ask just how much criticism and how many attacks can any individual stand, and will the system continue to function without the public support of elected officials of integrity and ability. This by no means excludes legitimate criticism and prompt and adequate punishment of malefactors.

Our young people especially need to be given perspective, both in the framework of the history of government and through the comparison of the different political systems of the world today so they can judge our system on sound information.

There is need for us to appreciate the values of our own system as well as to understand and remedy its shortcomings. And while we should and do work to bring about remedy and improvement we would do ourselves and the system a great disservice if we emphasized only defects.

MONEY COULD BE AVAILABLE FOR THE POVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was much interested in the remarks of my good friend Congressman DEVINE to the effect that I did not really have much concern about where the money would come from if we would raise social security payments and if we would enact a \$200 Federal income tax exemption. The gentleman should never have asked that question, because I have been here in the well of this House each year when the tax bill is debated explaining where \$7 billion or \$8 billion dollars would be collected by the Federal Government if we could repeal tax loopholes and compel the large oil companies, real estate foundations, and so forth, pay some taxes. If we could get more help from the Republican side and also more Members on the Democratic side the Government would have plenty of money to take care of all our local problems in-

cluding poverty. Most of these tax dodgers are in about the same tax-exempt status they were before the Senate or the House went to work trying to enact a tax reform bill.

Furthermore, I have spent a great deal of time in the well of the House trying to get some Republican support to cut down the \$3.5 billion farm bonanza. I do not know how Congressman DEVINE, my good friend, voted on that, but I and other Members have tried to knock some of the billions off the farm bonanza, but we just cannot succeed. The House limited the annual amount to \$23,000 for any one farm operation. There are six farm operations that are getting over \$1 million a year just for idle land out in the desert country. And there are about 300 farms getting between \$200,000 and \$1 million every year for idle land. I have tried to get my Republican friends over here to come along and cut that down. If we did so, we would have plenty of money for the relief of poverty. We would have billions for poverty and other necessary domestic programs if we could repeal only 50 percent of the fabulous loopholes. Some of the Republicans go along on it, but most of them do not. If we could make oil pay a just share of taxes; if we could cut down the farm giveaway bonanza, we would have no trouble on the poverty or other domestic programs.

WHERE DOES THE MONEY GO?

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman from Indiana referred to what he called the fraudulent agricultural appropriations.

There is something fraudulent about those appropriations, but only in that they do not accurately reflect how the money is spent.

The gentleman from Indiana must remember there is a billion dollars in the Agriculture Department appropriation for food stamps, for school milk, and for school lunches.

There are other millions of dollars in that budget for foreign aid through Public Law 480.

There is a vast amount of money in the Agriculture Department appropriation to maintain and manage our national forests.

There is other money, millions of dollars, in the Agriculture Department budget for flood control and for soil conservation.

There is other money in that Agriculture Department budget to take care of the needs of other people not living on farms; for instance, for the inspection of foods, meats, and agricultural products.

Let it not be said by anyone on this floor that the \$3.5 billion, or whatever it is as an appropriation for the Agriculture Department, is a bonanza for the farmers of the United States. That it certainly is not.

CEMENTING UNITED STATES-JAPANESE RELATIONS

(Mr. WYATT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original members of the informal United States-Japan Parliamentary Conference, I have developed a considerable interest in the relations of our countries. During the past few years, I have become acquainted with the Japan-American Cultural Society in Tokyo. Mr. Jiuji G. Kasai, president of the society, has just been in Washington, in the interests of founding the Abraham Lincoln Cultural Center in Japan.

David Lawrence wrote a revealing article on this subject, which I herewith commend to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 8, 1969]

JAPAN-U.S. CULTURE CENTER SOUGHT

(By David Lawrence)

How many people know that the United States furnished large amounts of economic assistance for the reconstruction of Japan after World War II—in the occupation period between September 1945 and April 1952? How many people know that the government of Japan agreed in 1962 to pay back \$490 million and has already done so? It was agreed also that about \$25 million of that sum would be set aside for cultural exchange programs between the two countries.

An organization in Tokyo known as the Japan-American Cultural Society now would like to see at least \$12 million of the money used for the founding of an Abraham Lincoln Cultural Center in Japan.

Jiuji G. Kasai, president of the Japanese organization, visited this correspondent a few days ago to tell of the new venture to honor Abraham Lincoln. Kasai graduated from the University of Chicago, and has always been friendly to America.

Incidentally, Kasai, who in 1941 was chairman of an important committee of the Japanese parliament, made an earnest attempt in August of that year to prevent war between this country and Japan. At that time, he came to Washington and told this writer that war might break out, that anti-American feeling was building up because of the embargo placed on strategic materials by President Roosevelt, and that reckless militarists in the Tokyo government were pursuing a dangerous course.

Kasai and this correspondent discussed the problem with the Japanese ambassador in Washington for two hours. A conference was arranged for Kasai with State Department officials. Communication in those days with the Japanese military government, however, was not very fruitful, and the attack on Pearl Harbor came 28 years ago yesterday. Ever since that time, Kasai has been constantly seeking to develop friendly relations between the United States and Japan.

Congress has not yet appropriated for the Abraham Lincoln center any portion of the residue of Japanese repayments set aside for cultural exchange. The project has the sympathetic support of the State Department, and the matter will be presented to Congress some time during the January session.

The proposed activities of the Japan-American Cultural Society include the acquisition and maintenance of a comprehensive public library featuring books and articles about Lincoln, and the sponsoring of lectures and seminars in the field of American studies. Special courses would be offered for young Japanese in comparative studies of the history of the United States and Japan, and they would be designed "to inspire them to emulate Abraham Lincoln's ideals, character and achievements." Scholarships would be furnished to enable Japanese students to attend American colleges and universities.

Kasai, in his proposal for the establishment of the Abraham Lincoln Center, says:

"Japan owes her present prosperity to post-war American economic assistance, and our people are enjoying unprecedented peace and security, thanks to the U.S.-Japan security treaty. It is universally recognized, however, that in the immediate future Japan will encounter major issues of paramount importance to the very future of the nation as well as to prospects for world peace.

"Communist infiltration of many segments of the Japanese society, especially the educational system, has produced social and political disturbances which clearly threaten the viability of the democratic form of government in our country. Meanwhile, in the arena of international affairs, questions such as Okinawa and trade liberalization are severely testing the durability of our present friendly and mutually beneficial relations with the United States of America.

"It goes without saying that in Japan the times urgently demand, on the one hand, a vigorous campaign to propagate the principles of liberty, justice and democracy, and on the other hand, a major effort to promote better understanding between the people of the United States and Japan through effective educational exchange, information, and cultural activities."

There is no doubt that Japan can exert a big influence toward the maintenance of peace in the Far East. The recent visit to Washington by Prime Minister Sato resulted in a promise by the United States to return Okinawa. This agreement, it is expected, will placate many of the critics inside Japan.

AMENDMENT TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed upon that air pollution is one of the most pressing problems that we face today. To solve this problem, we need a coordinated effort by local, State, and Federal officials, as well as the active support of every private citizen in this country.

Under the present Clean Air Act, this effort is being hampered. Public Law 90-148 provides that the Federal Government would give two-thirds budgetary grants to approved air pollution enforcement agencies. In an effort to acquire greater regional control, the National Air Pollution Control Administration will give a three-fourths grant if two or more municipalities or communities join to form a regional district, or if two or more States coordinate their efforts under a single agency.

The Clean Air Act adversely affects three States in this country: Arkansas, Louisiana, and my own State of Rhode Island. In each of these areas, the authority for air pollution control enforcement is vested in the State itself, with no enforcement subdivisions, such as regional, municipal, or county control agencies. These three States, while carrying out the Federal philosophy of combating pollution on a broad and coordinated scale, are denied the opportunity to receive anything above a two-thirds grant.

Today Congressmen CAFFERY, HAMMERSCHMIDT, PASSMAN, PRYOR, ST GERMAIN, and WAGGONER have joined me in introducing legislation which would amend the Clean Air Act to allow single State agencies to receive three-fourths grants. In Rhode Island alone,

the adoption of this bill would have made the State eligible to receive an additional \$17,000 in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to understand the justification behind the present limitation put on single State agencies. Air pollution is a major problem for all sections of each of the 50 States. Certainly, the pollution is heavier and more readily seen over cities than in rural areas. But let us not deceive ourselves, the pollution is there—it is everywhere.

Americans annually spew 150 million tons of pollutants into the atmosphere, and 90 percent of this consists of largely invisible but potentially lethal gas. Moreover, these contaminants are boundless in their effects. The air carries pollution far beyond city or county limits, as do automobiles and out-of-city factories.

In introducing this legislation, I am not implying that the additional money which would be made available to these three States—and any future States which might decide to coordinate their efforts under one State agency—will solve the air pollution problem. Certainly \$17,000 additional funds for Rhode Island will not by itself save us from these pollutants, but it is a step in the right direction.

The Government estimates that air pollution damage to animals, crops, paper, cloth, rubber, leather, and stone costs each man, woman, and child in this country \$65 a year, and this is excluding damage to human life. Presently the National Air Pollution Control Administration is providing an average of 35 cents per person to fight air pollution. With the gravity of the problem so extreme, this paltry amount is inexcusable.

The burden of proof must also lie with the Congress, for we are the ones who appropriate the funds to NAPCA. We hear the American Cancer Society advertising about matters of life and death. Certainly, air pollution is one of these matters, and it is a blot on the record, and hopefully on the conscience, of the whole Congress that more money is not provided to fight pollution.

Mr. Speaker, above us there is a narrow band of usable atmosphere, no more than 7 miles high, with no "new" air available. Individual States that wish to consolidate their efforts to preserve this atmosphere must not be punished. They should be eligible to obtain three-fourths grants, just as counties or States who coordinate their efforts receive.

I hope that my colleagues will see the need for rectifying this unjust situation immediately.

PROBLEM OF PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

(Mr. HAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current study being made by the Supreme Court on the constitutionality of a law under which a person can prevent obscene mail from being mailed to his home simply by asking the Post Office to stop it, I wish to comment

on the very serious problem we are facing today regarding the widespread distribution of this pornographic material in our Nation.

In homes across the country our people are receiving a tremendous amount of obscene material that is not only unsolicited and unwelcome but shocking in content. I have received a great deal of mail from my own district complaining of this literature and enclosing samples of the material received. There is no doubt that this is hard-core pornography and extremely objectionable. The realization that this smut is being sent through the U.S. mail to minors, some as young as 10 and 12 years old, makes me wonder if this is not carrying freedom of expression just a little too far. It is time we all stop and remember that some standards of decency—a sometimes forgotten word these days—must prevail, particularly where our young folks are concerned.

When Public Law 90-206, dealing with the prohibition of pandering advertisements in the mails was enacted by the 90th Congress, we believed we had taken a big step forward in preventing this kind of obscenity from getting into homes where it was unwanted. And, I believe it is beginning to have some impact. I sincerely hope the Supreme Court will not see fit to weaken this law. If anything, we need to do more in this area.

Several months ago, out of my concern over this situation, I introduced a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of obscene materials to persons under the age of 18 years, to restrict the exhibition of movies or other obscene matter to such persons and to prohibit the sale of mailing lists used to disseminate by mail obscene materials to such persons.

This bill will make it a Federal crime for whoever knowingly uses the mails for the mailing of any material defined in this act to be nonmailable with a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both for the first offense and a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years or both for each offense thereafter. I do not think smut peddlers should be permitted to use mail privileges to make profits on this objectionable material. The American people should not have to subsidize pornographers.

In connection with the mails, a section is included in the bill stating that it shall be unlawful for any person to sell or offer for sale any mailing list knowing that such list will be used to sell, offer for sale, loan or deliver, through the mails to any minor photographs, films, books, pamphlets, magazines, recordings, or similar matter deemed obscene according to the definitions of this measure. Pornography mappers pay high prices for the names and addresses of young people below the age of 18. This must be curtailed.

Because of the direction our courts have been taking lately, a section has been added to the bill stating that the Supreme Court and courts of appeals shall not have jurisdiction under certain specified sections of the United States

Code to review any determination made that any material described, in certain sections of title 18, is designed primarily to appeal to a minor's prurient interests. There has been far too much leniency on the side of what constitutes decency. Too many Supreme Court decisions have judged obvious and flagrantly obscene material to be deserving of the constitutional protection of freedom of speech and press. I believe an individual's right to privacy must also be considered. I do not claim to be an expert on pornography but as a parent, a citizen, and a legislator, I claim the right to protect our children from the smut peddler and unwholesome influence of his wares.

I defend the right of parents to protect their children from this pornographic material. They have spent years educating their children in the moral values of our society and now, we here in Congress, have the opportunity and obligation to help them by enacting responsible and reasonable laws to keep this highly undesirable material from reaching their children through the mails.

I believe that the immediate need for such legislation will become more and more evident as the current hearings on obscenity progress. I urge careful consideration of the many similar bills that have been introduced on this subject, and that we, as a body, do everything we can to stop this traffic in filth that is so destructive to the moral fiber of our Nation.

GERMAN MEASLES VACCINATIONS UNDER THE PARTNERSHIP IN HEALTH PROGRAM

(Mr. SMITH of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the partnership for health program is not working adequately as a vehicle for executing a rubella vaccination program.

There seems to be some misinformation and a considerable lack of complete information concerning the rubella—german measles—control program. As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which recommended appropriations for research on rubella and for this vaccination program, I have been very much interested in this subject matter and believe that a summary of the facts might be helpful.

Rubella, which is commonly called german measles, is one of those communicable diseases which is mild for children. The fact that it is not serious to children reduces the incentive for parents of small children to rush to the doctor's office and pay \$6 for a shot for the child and the fact it is not serious to the child makes the possibility of children having a rash for 2 or 3 days seems preferable. However, children carry the disease to adults and the consequences can be very serious to the unborn child of a pregnant woman because the incidence of retardation in such children is greatly increased. Retardation is a very, very serious problem both because it is so exceedingly difficult to even partially overcome but also because it is one of the most costly. It is so much in the interest

of all citizens both financially and socially that any action whatever should be taken which might reduce the number of retarded children.

Outbreaks of german measles seem to go somewhat in cycles and next year is expected to be one of the years when there is an epidemic. Therefore, it is even more important that any control program be executed as soon as possible.

In early February of this year, the National Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Ga., which is financed through the National Institutes of Health, reported to our House Appropriations Subcommittee on Health that they were virtually certain that a breakthrough had finally been obtained and that a vaccine for rubella could be licensed. They asked for an emergency appropriation so that they could launch a nationwide vaccination program when and if the vaccine is licensed. The Congress immediately gave them all the funds they had asked for and told them that if more money is needed to come back. I do not believe there was a single dissent in Congress and this is one of the few programs that the administration's Budget Bureau did not reduce.

There are, however, certain problems and limitations upon launching an immediate nationwide vaccination program for rubella. The vaccine, which was finally licensed in June for one company and for another company this past week, is a live virus and it is not advisable that it be given to females who may possibly be pregnant because this would increase rather than reduce the risk of bearing retarded children. Since it is an injected vaccine, rather than an oral vaccine like polio, there are certain problems and it must be given under medical supervision. This is different than the polio pills which were given orally and it did not even hurt if persons received more than one dose of those pills. They could be and were distributed to various groups and handed out almost indiscriminately through schools; but rubella vaccine must be distributed under a supervised program. Due to these limitations it was felt that the limited quantities of vaccine first available should be injected primarily into young school-age children who are the most susceptible and most apt to carry the disease to their mothers who might be pregnant.

Following the polio vaccination episode, it was strongly felt that some kind of a national program was needed in order to distribute on a wide basis the great benefits of health research when a new vaccine is discovered. The Partnership for Health Act was passed. The medical profession and most involved felt that under this new program State health departments and county health departments could be developed and that it would provide the best way to supervise a program such as the German measles vaccination program that is now underway. In my opinion, confidence in such a program meeting the test was not warranted and a much better program must be developed. The so-called Partnership for Health Act provides an allotment of money to the States on a population basis to encourage them to

set up State and county health organizations. There are also grants on a population basis for specific projects like rubella vaccination. Some States have responded by more than meeting the Federal grants while other States do not even meet the Federal grants overall—let alone for specific projects like that for rubella. Iowa has been in the latter category along with many other States.

It seems to me that it is almost an impossibility to have a mass immunization program where we depend not only upon 50 individual States but where those States, in turn, also must depend upon about 100 independent county health departments. In Virginia, for example, one county has a good immunization program well underway while the neighboring county medical society or health department said they were not even interested. With the shifting population and mobility of our people, women in the county with the immunization program can be exposed to the disease by children from the neighboring county as they go to the shopping center and as children and families move from one county to the other. In my opinion, the Partnership for Health Act does not provide adequate machinery but it is all we have to work with as of today.

Let us use Iowa as an example and I hasten to say that while many States have a far better record of supporting health programs, there are also some with worse records; \$245,000 was allocated to Iowa by the Federal Government for a rubella vaccination program. Iowa, in its application for the money, could indicate that all of it would be used for vaccine or they could divide as they saw fit. Iowa chose to apply most of the Federal money to operating costs and supporting personnel. There is no requirement in the Partnership for Health Act that the money be used for vaccine or that it be shown that the money specifically be spent for additional personnel and cost; therefore, some of the States merely use the money to pay part of the salaries of personnel already on the payroll.

We really have no assurance that allocating additional Federal dollars to the project will secure additional results. In its application, Iowa said they would put up \$47,700. But, most or some of this was in "in kind" and other services and might even include services that had already been paid for partly by the Federal Government. Actually more than 50 percent of the cost of operating the Iowa State Health Department, as a whole, comes from Federal funds.

When the rubella program was launched, some States immediately put up more State money than they received Federal money and launched an effective program but many, if not most, were in the category, like Iowa, where they simply did not put up State and local money to complete the Partnership in Health Act and execute this rubella project with the promptness or on the level needed.

Since I have had grave doubts that the partnership for health program would adequately meet the test, I have kept a close eye on this rubella program and

the Assistant Surgeon General in charge of the National Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Ga., Dr. David J. Sencer, came to Washington for a conference concerning the progress of the program. He personally assured me that he had received from the Congress all of the funds that they feel can be appropriately utilized at the present time. I am not going to dispute him on this and I greatly fear that allocation of additional Federal funds for rubella projects might very well result only in an offsetting reduction in State and local efforts. However, I think the overall program is so important that we should not take any chances and I am going to seek an additional \$20 million over what the administration says they need. That will just about double the funds distributed for these project grants. If this merely results in State and local governments having to put up less money, it will not be money lost but rather a shift in the cost of funding State and local health departments.

Meanwhile, I think it is imperative that Congress thoroughly examine the Partnership for Health Act and try to develop some kind of a program where State and local governments become genuine partners rather than the mere recipients of funds based upon population and that we develop the machinery whereby the great benefits of research and the breakthroughs that we expect in the next few years can be distributed nationwide much more rapidly and effectively than they can be under the present setup which so completely depends upon State and county health departments, many of which are so lethargic or so underfunded by their State legislature that they cannot possibly meet the needs in a way that will eradicate the communicable diseases.

TELEVISION OPERATION

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that Rev. Everett Parker of the United Church of Christ appeared before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Communications, concerning S. 2004, a bill that would require the FCC to determine whether a television station was operating in the public interest before reviewing petitions for a competing license.

The first two paragraphs of Dr. Parker's article were extremely interesting in light of the fact that he states that the Internal Revenue Service has threatened his group with the loss of their tax exemption because of their engaging in political activities. I believe that Dr. Parker in his comments did not understand the thrust of the letter which the Internal Revenue Service sent to him.

All churches are exempt from taxation under section 501 C3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. As stated in the code, no group, such as churches, foundations, and charitable organizations, can devote a substantial amount of their

funds toward influencing legislation or issuing propaganda regarding legislation. The basic reason for this is that all groups within the political arena should work under the same set of handicaps. To allow churches involved in political propaganda a special tax-exempt status is to subsidize political activities by these groups. Tax-exempt status for churches was never intended to serve political purposes.

Last June when reviewing Congressional Quarterly, I noticed that certain tax-exempt church organizations had formed a Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy. This coalition was violently opposed to President Nixon's ABM program. The coalition was financed by funds derived from tax-exempt church organizations. Their activities were in violation of the law. Among the groups that were financing the coalition was the United Church of Christ and the National Council of Churches. I sent a list of these groups to the Internal Revenue Commissioner, Randolph Thrower, requesting that he remove their tax-exempt status. Below is a copy of the letter I sent to Commissioner Thrower and a copy of his response to me. Apparently the Commissioner investigated this matter and requested his district offices to send warning letters to the different church groups informing them of the law. After reviewing these letters, which I will insert into the RECORD, you will see that the IRS' purpose was simply to inform the church groups of their obligation to observe the law.

The coalition began a new propaganda effort after they had been defeated on the ABM issue on September 24 by urging all Members of Congress to vote against the Department of Defense authorization bill. For the information of my colleagues, I am hereby inserting a copy of this letter into the RECORD. Again, I feel that this activity was of the nature prohibited by the Internal Revenue Code. One more fact I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues is that Dr. Parker stated in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Communications that his group, the United Church of Christ, had not appeared before the Congress since 1952. However, I will be charitable in commenting upon his veracity by observing that he is mistaken. In the Atlanta Journal of June 9, 1969, an article appears stating that Jackie Robinson appeared before the House Appropriations Committee as a representative for the United Church of Christ urging that no funds be appropriated for the ABM project. For the information of my colleagues, I am hereby inserting this article into the RECORD.

On December 9, 1969, I received a letter from Mr. Tilford E. Dudley, director of the Washington office, United Church of Christ, Council for Christian Social Action, regarding the Tax Reform Act of 1969. It is clear that this letter is of a political nature and is an attempt to lobby among Congressmen for certain forms of social action.

One sentence from the letter states: "You will note the comment that 'America needs to spend more' for domestic so-

cial service." Also, attached to this letter was a booklet entitled, "Social Action" and it was devoted completely to "Tax Revolt and Tax Reform." I would like to invite your attention to a few of the titles of articles appearing in this booklet: "Tax Revolt and Tax Reform—Editorial," "Tax Exemption of Churches: A Policy Statement of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.," "The Battle in Congress," and "Tax Restrictions of Foundation."

This group is delving into highly controversial areas of tax reform and I do not believe that this can be considered relevant to the religious functions of a church group. This book is pure propaganda in its approach; it presents only one side of each issue and does this in highly biased and inflammatory terms. Today, I am forwarding a copy of this booklet to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for his edification since I am sure that he will be interested in knowing of the activities of the United Church of Christ.

I applaud the actions of the Internal Revenue Service in this area. I feel that for far too many years tax-exempt groups have been lobbying for and against legislation which is not directly related to their tax-exempt status. Recently I introduced a bill which would allow these groups to continue their tax-exempt status only if they promote or oppose legislation in direct relation to their tax-exempt status. However, my legislation specifically prohibits them from using tax-exempt funds for lobbying against nonrelated proposals and mounting massive propaganda campaigns in order to influence public thinking.

I feel very strongly that revisions need to be made in the income tax law with regard to tax-exempt organizations and I believe that the recent actions of the Internal Revenue Service point this out most vividly.

The material follows:

COALITION ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES
AND MILITARY POLICY,

Washington, D.C., September 24, 1969.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We understand that the Department of Defense Authorization bill will be reported by the House Armed Services Committee on Thursday and may come to the floor next week.

We appeal to you to participate in that most vital debate. If you are not already convinced of the need for major cuts, we urge you to give serious consideration to the broad cross section of amendments that will be offered. We ask this because we are deeply uneasy over the fact that last year a comparable bill passed the House in one day with only two hours allocated to general debate.

Surely the House would lay itself open to the charge of irresponsibility if a similar timetable were adhered to now when so many questions are being raised about U.S. priorities and the size and direction of the U.S. military establishment—so many questions, in fact, that the Senate spent two months discussing the bill. Couldn't the 435 Members of the House spend at least two weeks discussing these basic issues which affect so many aspects of their constituents' lives?

The American people are discouraged over the conflicts racking our society. Many are turning away from the legislative process. They need reassurance that their represent-

atives in Congress are willing to come to grips with major problems—including the problems of the ever expanding arms race and the U.S. propensity toward unilateral military involvements. Some of our membership look forward to coming to the gallery and hearing you deliberate over the Department of Defense Authorization bill. Please do not disappoint them.

Most sincerely,

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Chairman.

COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN
SOCIAL ACTION,
December 5, 1969.

Re: Tax reform.

To the Members of Congress:

Enclosed is a complimentary copy of our current Social Action magazine. You will see there a comprehensive article by Professors Byron L. Johnson and William S. Vickrey on the "Moral Issues in United States Tax Policy."

The major points of this article were embodied in a Pronouncement adopted last July by the Synod of the United Church, after seven years of study and the circulation of several proposals on tax reform among the local churches. The United Church of Christ is a major Protestant denomination with over 2 million members in over 7,000 local churches.

In terms of the issues now before Congress, the highlights of the article and the pronouncement probably are: a) taxation of interest from State-local government bonds; b) ending the preferential treatment for capital gains; c) replacing the depletion loopholes for oil-gas investors with the usual depreciation provisions; d) normal taxes for church properties and businesses not related to religious pursuits.

The emphasis in the magazine is on *sharing the cost of government fairly* rather than on a reduction in taxes, except for the poor. You will note the comment that "America needs to spend more" for domestic social services.

We hope this magazine will be of use to you.

Respectfully yours,

TILFORD E. DUDLEY,
Director, Washington Office.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT COM-
MISSIONER, INTERNAL REVENUE
SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., June 30, 1969.

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Thank you for your letter of June 12, 1969, commenting on the activities of certain religious organizations and requesting that the Service investigate these activities.

The Service has been very concerned about the kinds of activities to which you refer. As you may know, we have recently undertaken an expanded program to review the operations of exempt organizations and to take action where we think their activities have gone beyond the appropriate bounds. I am certain you can appreciate that we can only work on these matters in depth where there is a reasonable prospect of a violation of the statute and where we have manpower available for the task at hand. In any event, I am forwarding the information you furnished to the appropriate District Directors for their consideration.

With regard to your reference to the Sierra Club, we did find that a substantial portion of its activities was directed at influencing legislation. Obviously, in each case we can only make a determination after a close audit examination. However, given the principal purpose of the Sierra Club, to promote conservation—which generally requires involvement in legislation, as contrasted with the

principal purposes of the religious organizations, we are not as apt to find in the case of the latter that a "substantial" amount of activity is directed toward influencing legislation.

I appreciate your having brought this matter to my attention.

With best personal regards,
Sincerely,

RANDOLPH,
Commissioner.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT DIRECTOR, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,

New York, N.Y., August 8, 1969.

UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: It has been brought to the attention of this office that various religious organizations have been engaged in lobbying activities or are conducting propaganda in political or legislative areas.

Please note that the Federal income tax exemption granted to a religious organization described in Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code is authorized on the condition that no substantial part of its activities shall be the carrying on of propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation. Such activities are specifically defined in Regulations 1.501(c)(3)-1(c)(3) and include contacting or urging the public to contact members of a legislative body to propose, support or oppose legislation and the advocacy of adoption or rejection of legislation. Any organization carrying on substantial activities of this nature is regarded as not being operated exclusively for exempt purposes and is not qualified for income tax exemption under the requirements of Section 501(c)(3) of the Code.

The foregoing is provided for your information and guidance.

Sincerely yours,

Acting District Director.

HON. RANDOLPH THROWER,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: Several times in the past few weeks I have discussed with you the need to revise the Internal Revenue Code, Section 501(C), with regard to political activities by tax-exempt organizations.

I am very much aware of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee has taken steps to control political activities by foundations but other groups will not be affected by current recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee.

You are no doubt aware that there is a great deal of debate in the Congress over President Nixon's proposed ABM system. During the past few weeks, a number of organizations which are exempt for purposes other than promoting "social welfare" are engaged in lobbying and other political activities with regard to this proposed legislation. For your information, I am below listing the names of these organizations. They are as follows:

United Methodist Church, Division of World Peace, The National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, The United Presbyterian Churches in the U.S.A., The United Church of Christ in the U.S., Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Church of the Brethren General Board, The Lutheran Council in the U.S., The United States Catholic Conference, Anti-Pollution League Association of Monterey, California, The Executive Council of the Episcopal Protestants Churches.

As you see, many of these organizations are exempt as church or religious organizations. Therefore, I request that you investigate the actions of the above mentioned organizations and inform them, if you find that they might be violating the law, that

their exempt status might be jeopardized by this activity.

Furthermore, when investigating this case, I would appreciate it if you would keep in mind the famous Sierra Club case in which the Internal Revenue Service took away the Sierra Club's C(3) status because it published several ads in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* opposing an Administration proposal to build dams near the Grand Canyon.

I would appreciate it greatly if you would inform me of the Internal Revenue Service's position on this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

BEN B. BLACKBURN,
Member of Congress.

STRIKE OUT ABM, SPORT GREAT URGES

WASHINGTON.—Former baseball great Jackie Robinson Monday urged Congress not to appropriate funds for President Nixon's proposed Safeguard antimissile system.

In testimony prepared for a hearing by the House Appropriations Committee, the Negro athlete argued that "an overpreoccupation with a possible future external threat on which we are preparing to spend billions of dollars has blinded us to human misery at home."

He said deployment of the Safeguard would distort national priorities, lead to an escalation of the arms race and ruin any potential arms control agreements with other nations.

Robinson represented the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ.

A vice president of the NAACP, Robinson was a Republican and a former aide to New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, but last year he endorsed Democratic candidate Hubert H. Humphrey for president.

His testimony comes as the major showdown on the antiballistic missile—ABM—issue is nearing in the Senate.

While some GOP senators have been talking about a compromise delay in ABM deployment, the Senate's Republican leader says he hasn't seen any indication, President Nixon would accept any such proposal.

Sen. Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois termed the compromise proposals "a little flight in semantics."

One of the compromises is expected to be put before the Senate Armed Services Committee which starts Tuesday on its job of working over a \$25 billion military procurement authorization bill—including an \$800 million administration request for Safeguard.

Dirksen's comments seemed to shoot down proposals being made by the assistant GOP leader, Sen. Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, and Sen. Edward W. Brooke, R-Mass., that would provide for delays of ABM deployment.

Scott indicated he was sending up a trial balloon when he suggested the Pentagon might hold off ABM development for several months to allow time for arms-control talks with the Soviet Union. Brooke is pushing a proposal to delay actual deployment, using the next year for ABM research and development.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, those of us from the Southwest are particularly proud of our Mexican-American heritage. In my State of Arizona, these ties are particularly strong due to our close proximity to the Republic of Mexico.

Today, throughout the five Southwest-ern States, Mexican Americans account

for over 12 percent of the total population and their contributions to the character and development of our part of the country have been far in excess of that percentage.

Nevertheless, the unfortunate fact remains that many of the opportunities afforded by our society have not been extended effectively to large segments of our Mexican-American population. Their problems like those of the American Indian in the Western United States, are often unique and must be addressed as such.

Much of this problem, in my opinion, results from a lack of communication between the government and the people involved—first, in identifying the particular task and second, in delivering an appropriate response. In the area of Mexican-American affairs this communications problem is intensified due to a combination of economic, linguistic, and cultural factors.

With the object of narrowing this informational gap, I joined with a number of my colleagues last March in introducing a bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican Affairs on a statutory basis. In the language of H.R. 9330, the purpose of the bill was "to assure that Federal programs are reaching all Spanish Americans and providing the assistance they need, and to seek out new programs that may be necessary to handle problems that are unique to the Spanish-American community."

I am glad that the House Committee on Government Operations has favorably reported this bill—now renamed the "Cabinet Committee on Opportunities of Spanish-Speaking People"—and hope that the full House will act favorably upon it. While this legislation does not answer all of the problems of Mexican Americans, it is certainly a step in the right direction.

RESULTS OF POLL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in October I sent to my constituents in Minnesota's Third Congressional District a questionnaire soliciting their views on 14 important issues now under consideration by the Congress. The response was immediate and enthusiastic, and I would like to thank the more than 21,000 citizens who took the time to complete and return this poll.

The results indicate that the great majority of Minnesotans living in Anoka and suburban and rural Hennepin Counties favor President Nixon's major proposals in the field of welfare reform, revenue sharing, direct popular election of the President, and postal reform. Given four possible policy alternatives on Vietnam, more than half of my constituents support the President's efforts to achieve peace through Vietnamization.

The almost even division on the question of deploying an anti-ballistic-missile system parallels the close vote on this issue in the U.S. Senate. This result plus the overwhelming response in favor of increased spending to help cure all as-

pects of our environmental pollution problems reflects the growing desire to apply an increasing proportion of our financial resources to meet our pressing domestic problems.

Knowing that my colleagues in Congress will be interested in the response of thousands of Minnesotans to these vital questions, I include here the tabulated results of this poll:

Results of Clark MacGregor's 1969 constituent questionnaire
(In percent)

1. Should President Nixon's Family Assistance and Workfare Program be set up in place of the existing welfare system?

Yes	74.8
No	11.7
Undecided	13.5

2. Should a percentage of Federal income tax money be shared with the cities and states for use as they see fit?

Yes	70.4
No	25.5
Undecided	4.1

3. Should Federal aid be cut off from colleges and universities who do not discipline rioting students to the satisfaction of Washington officials?

Yes	63.4
No	34.5
Undecided	2.1

4. Should we elect the President by direct nationwide vote of the people?

Yes	87.9
No	10.5
Undecided	1.6

5. Should we amend the U.S. Constitution to give 19-year olds the vote?

Yes	46.7
No	51.8
Undecided	1.5

6. Should we create a self-supporting U.S. postal corporation in place of the present postal system?

Yes	74.8
No	20.6
Undecided	4.6

7. Should we pick draftees from among eligible 19-year olds by random selection (lottery)?

Yes	69.0
No	23.8
Undecided	7.2

8. Should we step up space spending with the goal of putting a man on Mars in the 1980's?

Yes	20.4
No	76.7
Undecided	2.9

9. Do you favor President Nixon's Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system (ABM)?

Yes	45.5
No	45.2
Undecided	9.3

10. Which course should we take in Vietnam?

(a) Maintain current U.S. force levels and operations while pursuing peace in the Paris talks.....	10.3
(b) Continue Paris negotiations, but accelerate withdrawal of U.S. troops and their replacement by South Vietnamese forces.....	52.4
(c) Resume and expand air and sea attacks on North Vietnam.....	16.9
(d) Withdraw all U.S. forces immediately	13.9
No answer.....	6.5

11. Should we step-up Federal spending on programs to combat water, air, and noise pollution?

Yes	92.1
No	6.5
Undecided	1.4

12. Should Congress authorize the funds necessary to establish Voyageurs National Park at Kabetogama?

Yes	64.2
No	29.0
Undecided	6.8

13. Should the Federal Government do more than it is now doing to control inflation?

Yes	65.8
No	27.8
Undecided	6.4

14. Should the Congress vote to spend additional money to build the civil Supersonic Transport Airplane?

Yes	21.6
No	75.0
Undecided	3.4

REPEAL OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT: A GIANT STEP BACKWARD FOR DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a coalition of southern Democrats, reactionary Republicans, and the Attorney General worked their will in the House. For the first time since the Congress began passing civil rights legislation in 1957, a giant step backward was taken in guaranteeing constitutional rights to all its citizens.

No one is fooled by the sanctimoniousness of the Attorney General's stated objectives in his substitute bill—to assure the right to vote to all persons in every State of the Union. The essence of the Attorney General's approach to voters rights for all citizens is easily equated with the administration's political "southern strategy."

The right to vote for black Americans who live in the South has been a hard-fought battle against every conceivable obstruction put in their path by a highly developed, skilled "southern strategy" long before the present administration decided where to look for future votes.

This country has just begun—and I repeat—has just begun to see real progress in race relations. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was fundamental to this progress. Almost 1 million southern Negro citizens, for the first time, were permitted under its provisions to register and to vote in local, State, and National elections. The guarantee of the right to vote is the most basic protection every American—black and white—must have if we are to remain a democracy. But, yesterday, erosion of this progress began here on the floor of the House.

The Southern States should not be permitted to engage in their old tactics of denying the right to vote to their Negro citizens—and this is what is being permitted by the acceptance in the House yesterday of the Attorney General's substitute bill.

One wonders how the Attorney General of the United States, with the power and the responsibility of his high office, can justify an action that would in effect destroy one of the most fundamental rights the Constitution has guaranteed to all Americans because of his desire to strengthen his party's political base in the South.

The most succinct and clear interpretation of the Attorney General's substitute bill was stated yesterday by the ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH) when he said that the Attorney General's bill "creates a remedy for which there is no wrong and leaves grievous wrongs without adequate remedy." And he then asked, as he did of the Attorney General when he testified before the committee, "What kind of civil rights bill is that?"

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times this morning commented editorially on the "sham substitute" to the simple extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which was reported out of the House Judiciary Committee. I call it to the attention of my colleagues, and ask that it be printed below. Perhaps it will help those Democrats and moderate Republicans who voted against the Attorney General's substitute bill to know—before the Vice President of the United States cites this editorial as another comment of the "Eastern Establishment"—that our efforts are being supported.

The editorial follows:

A DEFEAT FOR VOTING RIGHTS . . .

The Administration's "Southern strategy" has scored another victory in the House by defeating the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. After hectic, last-minute lobbying by White House and Justice Department aides, the Administration's substitute, which has the endorsement of Southern segregationists, won by a narrow 208-to-203 margin.

Although touted by the Republican leadership as "more comprehensive and equitable," the substitute bill is a sham. It is more comprehensive in that it indiscriminately squanders the efforts and the personnel required for the law's enforcement. It is more equitable in that it assumes that those who are not violating the law need as much policing as those who do. The answer to the segregationists who complained that the 1965 act was "regional" because it aimed at those seven states where fewer than 50 per cent of the eligible population went to the polls, clearly should be that the wrong needed righting where it did in fact exist.

Instead of requiring that the states submit voting law changes to the Federal Government for prior approval, the substituted (Administration) bill would put the burden of proof on the Federal Government. Thus, the Justice Department would first have to keep up with all state voting law changes and then initiate suits against any discriminatory ones after they had been made. At best—assuming that the department could keep up with an impossible task—this would often lead to court rulings long after the election; at worst, the courts could tie up or frustrate the law's enforcement.

Since the Senate has not yet voted for extension of the act, there is fortunately still a good chance to prevent a move that could wipe out the substantial gains already achieved in Negro voting rights. The addition of 800,000 Southern Negroes to the voting rolls since 1965 proves the effectiveness of the present law; the Administration's substitute bill represents an erosion of that law and of the rights it protects.

HOW IT LOOKS FROM INSIDE THE MAILBAG

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for some time now there has been quite a bit of commotion about the alleged deficiencies in the U.S. postal system. I, for one, have assumed a "show me" attitude because I have always marveled at the system that transmits over 81 billion pieces of mail a year and does it, in my opinion, fairly efficiently, given the fact that Congress has not, and is not now, appropriating the necessary moneys for decent pay for the workhorses of the postal system and does not—and has not—generally appropriated the sufficient moneys for modernization, acquisition of up-to-date equipment, and so forth.

Oh, I am sure that within the intricacies of such a vast and sprawling system there are things that need improvement, but this is true of most everything, including Congress.

The trouble is we take the postal system for granted and overlook the dramatic fact that the U.S. postal system transmits more mail than all the industrialized nations put together.

But when we look up a little history, then we can gain a better perspective.

In 1789, the beginning of our present Government, there were only 75 postmasters in the country. It was estimated that the total receipts of the postal system then were \$25,000.

Well, within 11 years there were 903 post offices. The postage on a single letter weighing one-quarter of an ounce was 10 cents from New York to Philadelphia. Newspapers were carried 100 miles for 1 cent. Magazines and printed matter of all kind were not privileged. According to the law prevailing in 1792, they were not received at all, and in 1794 the act was amended to give postmasters discretion as to whether they would take them or not.

So, here on November 28, 1969, Life magazine had a big spread about the U.S. mails, presumably to show that they were beyond hope. However, on page 27 the article gave the most eloquent and gratifying testimonial to the remarkable efficiency of the system. In an article entitled "How It Looks From Inside the Mailbag" the magazine narrated the journey of a letter traveling across the country—all of this for 10 cents in 22 hours—remember that is what it cost in 1800 to send a letter from New York to Philadelphia—that is a one-quarter of an ounce letter. Unwittingly, Life magazine has paid the U.S. system a high tribute, and I place into the RECORD at this point this Life magazine article.

HOW IT LOOKS FROM INSIDE THE MAILBAG

"You've got to try to see things from the letter's point of view."—Postal worker.

In an attempt to do so, a Life reporter recently accompanied an airmail letter on its 22-hour coast-to-coast journey from Boston to San Anselmo, Calif. Here is a letter's-eye view of that trip, with elapsed time in hours and minutes posted at each step.

0:00—Dropped into mailbox in front of John F. Kennedy Federal Building in downtown Boston.

0:14—One minute ahead of schedule, mailman Leonard Sansone opens box, scrapes contents into a dirty canvas bag and tosses it into his truck. He makes 17 stops. In the collection boxes, he remarks, he has on occasion found wallets, bottles, tin cans, sand, snow and obscene postcards.

1:14—Arrive at South Postal Annex, where most of Boston's mail is sorted. Heaved aboard a hand cart and wheeled to a 10-yard-long conveyor belt.

1:30—Dumped onto the belt. Men wearing open plaid shirts over T-shirts sift us with their hands like washerwomen, toss us and cullout the large manilas.

1:31—Ride a steeply inclined belt to the floor above. Then onto a third belt where men search through us for airmail.

1:40—Thrown aboard a higher belt which soon drops me down a chute into a canvas-walled cart against which a fellow named Angelo Itri is leaning while he waits for it to fill. He says that he has been wheeling the same cart for three years.

1:45—Freight elevator takes me down to the airmail section.

1:47—Tossed onto a table in front of a man with busy fingers named Donald Burns. He feeds me into a machine that separates us longs from the shorts. Then through the canceling machine, which thumps letters at the rate of 10,000 an hour. Mr. Burns, who has been at this for four years, says that a good operator can hear the difference in the thump when two of us slip through the machine together. He hears the difference and calls a cheater back. "The little ones go through better than the big ones," he says. "I don't know why."

1:57—My stamp, which has a picture of an old airplane on it, is inked over by a cartoon of a bear in a scout's hat and the legend: "Remember, only you can prevent Forest Fires."

2:02—Pigeonholes. No pigeon alive has been in as many pigeonholes as the average letter. The label reads: "California, 900-961." The numbers include the first three digits of my ZIP Code. In I go.

2:25—Letters from our pigeonhole are hand-carried to another stool where Lawrence Campbell slips me into a hole marked "SCF San Rafael 949." Mail to San Anselmo, a town of 13,000 people, is included in the San Rafael load. "The longer you're at it the better you are," he says. His field of holes numbers 63, but he doesn't know that. "I don't count the holes," he says. "I just throw the letters in and tie 'em out."

3:35—We are bound with rubber bands from top to bottom and side to side, and so become a little bundle bound for San Rafael. We are handed to John LaCorcia, who throws bundles into sacks that hang from metal frames in tightly packed rows. Some of the sacks are yards away, but he doesn't miss. Just before dispatching me into a yellow nylon sack marked "AMF San Francisco" (AMF stands for Airmail Facility), he mentions that he has been throwing mail for maybe 15 years. "You get so you can hit the corner pouch just like a basketball player."

4:12—"Bag off," somebody hollers, and bags are slipped off the frame, tied up, locked and thrown onto the scales. Airmail, flown by various commercial airlines, is paid for by the pound. My bag weighs 14 pounds.

4:20—Slung aboard a cart, wheeled to the loading ramp and dumped into a van for the trip to Logan International Airport.

4:50—We are all loaded into pods—big, silvery metal containers shaped to fit the belly of the plane.

5:35—Airborne for the first time, part of 7,000 to 8,000 pounds aboard American Flight No. 651.

6:50—Land at JFK Airport in New York for transfer to a San Francisco flight. No pods on this trip—bags will be stuffed loose, 15,000 pounds of them, into every cranny.

7:05—A lot of mail goes not to the bag-

gage compartment but to the tourist-class section of the cabin. Because not many people take this night flight—and also because mail pays better than people—30 seats are used for mailbags. But I go into the plane's belly.

7:40—Airborne again. There are canaries in here with the mail, hopping and peeping.

13:30—We land at San Francisco in the rain. The belly pops open. We whirl down a mobile conveyor belt and are tossed into a blue baggage cart behind a tractor that pulls us to the airmail department.

13:50—Hippies handling the U.S. mail! With a couple of unavoidable exceptions, a Post Office public relations man discourages long-haired workers from handling me while the camera lens is blinking. My bag, dropped down a chute, arrives quickly at a row of men who have before them a conveyor belt and electronic keyboards. They examine our labels and then push buttons that magically direct the belt to dump each bag off at an appropriate chute.

14:20—Dumped out on a shelf manned by a row of girls. Girls don't throw as well as boys, use a somewhat hitchy motion. Our little San Rafael bundle is accurately hurled into a hanging pouch marked "CALF.SCF,"

14:30—Our bundle is repouched in "SCF SN RAFAEL 959."

15:25—Thrown into a 2½-ton truck bound for San Rafael.

16:30—Arrive at San Rafael post office, where the bundle is sundered. I am repouched with the label "San Anselmo."

16:40—Slung into another truck bound for San Anselmo.

16:55—Arrive at San Anselmo in pouring rain. I go back to pigeonholes, slipped into one marked "ROUTE 2."

17:50—Route 2 mail is given to mailman Riley Brown. He handles mail for Crescent Road and looks me over. He says I am addressed to the wrong place, because the people have recently moved. I am given to John Cannedy, the mailman on the route where my addressee lives now. He pigeonholes me in 40 Park Way.

20:10—Bound with others by a leather strap, I am taken by truck to a relay station where Mr. Cannedy, who walks his route, will pick me up. Left in locked mail sack in a roofed outdoor hallway.

21:30—Mr. Cannedy, swishing along in gray rain gear, stuffs me into his leather pouch.

22:00—I am placed in a yellow mailbox with flowers pasted on it. I have been handled about 30 separate times and traveled 2,800 miles in 22 hours.

HANRAHAN, POLICE TELL PANTHER STORY

(Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the State's attorney police raid on the Black Panthers headquarters on the night of December 4, 1969. I am enclosing an article from the Friday, December 12, edition of the Chicago Tribune which is a detailed account of the police position. Furthermore it might be noted that State's Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan in another article in the same paper is quoted as welcoming "an investigation by the Department of Justice because it is a reliable, objective agency."

The article follows:

HANRAHAN, POLICE TELL PANTHER STORY

(By Edward Lee and Robert Wiedrich)

The first eye-witness accounts of state's attorney's policemen who took part in a gun

battle last Thursday with a band of Black Panthers were obtained exclusively Wednesday night by The Tribune.

State's Atty. Edward V. Hanrahan made the policemen available for interviews to refute what he termed an orgy of sensationalism in the press and on television since Black Panther leaders Fred Hampton and Mark Clark were slain in an exchange of gunfire with detectives in a West side apartment building.

Hanrahan and his top aids, Richard Jalovec, chief of the special prosecutions division, and Robert Boyle, criminal division chief, also made available official police photographs which they said conclusively proved the Panthers opened the battle by firing a shotgun blast thru the apartment door.

REASON FOR NO GAS

Hanrahan insisted that his man could not have fired tear gas shells into the flat first since, under the law, they were required to knock at the door in an attempt to serve a search warrant. The warrant was issued on the basis of information that the apartment was a clandestine cache for weapons.

Further, Hanrahan and his men declared that they had no prior knowledge that Hampton and Clark would be found in the flat. In fact, the identities of the two men were not learned until after they had been killed in the gun battle, the prosecutor said.

Sgt. Daniel Groth, who led the raiding party of 14 detectives, furnished the most dramatic description of the battle in which he described how he and his men fought it out with the Panthers in the darkened apartment which later was found to have been filled with shotguns, rifles, hand guns, and ample stores of ammunition for the various weapons.

Groth and Jalovec both said the foray on the Panther arsenal had its beginning Dec. 2, when informants who had previously furnished the prosecutor's office with reliable information reported the cache of guns in the first floor flat at 2337 Monroe st.

Jalovec had received his information earlier in the day, and Sgt. Groth received his from an informant who telephoned his home at 10:30 p. m. The following morning the men met at the state's attorney's office and compared notes.

According to the informants, at least three shotguns had been observed in the flat. Neither, however, made any mention of Hampton's or Clark's frequenting the apartment, Sgt. Groth said.

At noon, Sgt. Groth and Detectives James Davis and Bill Kelly discussed plans for the raid on the flat. This session was held after Sgt. Groth had personally surveyed the building and neighborhood and then dispatched Kelly and Davis to do the same.

REJECT EARLY NIGHT RAID

"At first I thought we'd hit the place at 8 o'clock that night," Sgt. Groth said. "But after talking it over, we decided that would be a bad time, both for our safety and that of residents of the area.

"It's a heavily populated neighborhood, so we feared first for the safety of people on the streets at that hour and secondly we feared such a raid might create an incident in the area, which we knew was the heart of Panther territory. Our object was to avoid an incident."

On this basis, Groth and the other detectives decided to stage the raid shortly before 5 o'clock the next morning, Thursday, Dec. 4. "This wasn't the first time our squads had gone after dangerous individuals," Sgt. Groth said. "And on the basis of the information we had, it was clear that we might be running up again dangerous individuals."

JUDGE ISSUES WARRANT

At 4:45 p.m. that day, Jalovec obtained a search warrant from Judge Robert Collins of Criminal court, citing the facts obtained from the informants. Then Groth drew a

lengthy series of orders for the 13 detectives who would accompany him, spelling out in detail each of their assignments in covering and entering the apartment's front and rear doors. Equipment drawn for the raid included a submachine gun, three shotguns, and walkie talkie radios.

"We didn't take tear gas because of the specific nature of our mission and the fact that we figured we'd have the element of surprise on our side," Groth said. "Under the law, we had to enter that flat and serve the warrant for a search. We couldn't just lob tear gas in there and charge."

Late that afternoon, the other detectives were told to report for duty at 4 a.m., but none other than Kelly and Davis were told what the mission would be.

At 4 o'clock the next morning, Sgt. Groth doled out the assignments which called for five men to enter the front door of the apartment, four to enter the rear, three to stay outside and cover the front exit, and two to perform similar duties at the rear.

The men stationed outside were assigned there not only to prevent anyone escaping thru windows, but to also serve as protection in the event of sniper fire from nearby buildings, Groth said. Included in the party of 14 policemen were five Negroes. The men arrived at the apartment at 4:45 a.m.

Sgt. Groth took Detectives Joseph Gorman, George Jones, Robert Hughes, and Davis to the front door. Meanwhile, Detectives Edward Carmody, John Ciszewski, Phillip Joseph, and William Kelly approached the rear door while Detectives John Marusich, Fred Howard, and Lynwood Harris covered the front yard. Detectives William Corbett and Ray Broderick covered the back yard.

EXTRA SQUADS REQUESTED

Just shortly before he arrived at the building, Sgt. Groth said that he radioed from the Chicago police department undercover squad car he was driving, asking that the squad operator dispatch marked cars from the Wood street district to the front and rear exits of the building.

"I told them we were about to attempt to serve a warrant," Groth said.

Once at the building, Groth ascended the front staircase on the exterior with Davis on his left. Behind them were Gorman, Jones, and Hughes. The men entered a small hallway containing two doors, one leading to the 2d floor and the other to the Panther apartment.

Positioning themselves to either side of the apartment door, Sgt. Groth said he reached over and first rapped firmly with his left hand. When there was no response, he pounded again, but this time with his revolver butt.

"I heard a voice inside—a male voice—call out, 'Who's there?'" Groth said. "I replied 'This is the police. I have a warrant to search the premises.'"

Again, there was no response, but Groth said he could hear movement inside. Again he said he pounded on the door, shouting, "Police! Open Up!"

"Just a minute," Groth said the male voice replied.

Suspicious of the delay, Groth said he ordered Davis to kick the door open. Davis kicked and the door slammed open to reveal a small ante-room with another door leading to the apartment's living room. That was shut.

Then suddenly, as the two policemen entered the ante-room, they said a shotgun blast was fired thru the closed living room door, a charge which later proved to have been a solid rifle load deer slug fired from a 12 gauge shotgun.

The slug pierced the door, ripping splinters from the outside of the door as it exited, and narrowly missed the two policemen. Photographs of this door were furnished The Tribune by Hanrahan as evidenced that the Panthers inside the flat fired the opening shot at his men.

PLUNGES THRU DOORWAY

Davis, who at this moment was just ahead of Sgt. Groth, plunged toward the door, smashing it open with his shoulders as he dived into the living room and landed on a mattress just to the left of the center of the room.

"I saw a woman half lying and half sitting upright on a bed in a far corner of the room trying to pump another shell into a shotgun she held jammed against her groin," Davis said. "She was about eight feet away."

"In that moment, the woman fired again, the flash of her weapon illuminating her face for Sgt. Groth who was still at the doorway of the room.

"I figured Davis had been hit when I saw him go down," Groth said. "That second shotgun round went right past me and I hugged the door jamb and narrowly missed hitting Hughes who was behind me. I fired two shots at her."

Almost simultaneously, Groth said he ordered Hughes to summon additional city police on the police radio. He also told him to notify the men at the rear of the building via walkie talkie radio that "these people are shooting in here!"

FIRES AT ARMED WOMAN

Davis said he rolled off the mattress and fired one shot from a carbine at the woman who later was identified as Miss Brenda Harris, 18, of 1848 S. Hamlin av.

"She slumped back against the wall with that shotgun still in her hands and I spun away and half turned, just in time to spot a guy sitting in a chair with a shotgun in his hands," Davis said. "He was directly behind me, hidden behind the door I'd just broken open. Thank God, Groth fired those shots at the woman. The flash of his revolver spotted the guy for me.

"I don't know for sure if he ever got a shot in at me or not. I fired twice and hit him. He stood up and I jumped up, too, struggling with him until he fell. Then I fell across his body."

This gunman was identified after the battle as Clark, 22, a Panther leader from Peoria.

Meanwhile, Detectives Jones and Gorman plunged into the darkened room which was lighted only by the dim glow of a gas space heater in a far corner, opposite of the bed on which Miss Harris was lying. Gorman crouched near the door and threw his flashlight momentarily on Miss Harris, then charged for the bed. The light had shown that she was wounded in her right thigh, altho she still held the shotgun in her hands.

DISCOVERS 3 MORE GUNS

"I yanked the gun from her hands and hurled it behind me toward the door," Gorman said. "In that moment, I also kicked aside a round hassock near the bed on which there were lying three hand guns. The guns spilled onto the floor.

Davis, who by this time had risen to a crouch, looked down the long hallway toward the rear of the flat just in time, he said, to see a man duck in and out of the rear bedroom nearest the kitchen. He had a shotgun.

"By then, the guys had broken down the kitchen door," Davis said. "I saw Ciszewski in the kitchen behind the gunman and hollered for him to duck as the man fired at least one round into the kitchen. Ciszewski ducked and the shot missed.

"Hold you fire," Sgt. Groth said he ordered his men at this point. "Give them a chance to come out!" This was the first of five such orders Groth said he gave during the fierce fire fight.

RESPONSE FROM FLAT

"I had men in both the front and rear of the apartment," he said. "I didn't want anyone getting hit in crossfire. But the words were barely out of my mouth before there was the whomp of a shotgun blast from the front bedroom, directly down the hall from the living room.

"They were firing blind because they didn't know where we were, so the charge slammed into a bathroom door almost directly across the hall."

Hanrahan also produced photographs of the inside of the bathroom door, showing how shotgun pellets had slammed through the wood. The prosecutor said that ballistics experts would testify during any court proceedings against the seven Panthers who survived the battle that the shotgun blast he claims opened the battle had in fact been fired from inside the apartment thru the door at police in the outer hallway.

As the shotgun blast was fired from the front bedroom, Detective Jones was crouching between two wooden dressers along one wall at the mouth of the long hall that stretches the length of the apartment. He said he saw a hand reach out from the rear bedroom and fire a shot with a revolver or automatic pistol at the kitchen where other detectives were crouching.

"SHOOT IT OUT!"

"It was just about then," Sgt. Groth said, "That I heard a voice call out from the front bedroom, 'Shoot it out!' This was followed by two flashes from the same room I believe were from a shotgun."

At this point, police resumed firing and then minutes later, or perhaps only seconds, Groth said, he again ordered his men to cease fire and again called out to the Panthers, "Come out with your hands up!"

At the rear of the apartment, Detective Carmody jumped over a wooden door that formed a barricade between the kitchen and dining room as the Panther fire continued. Gorman covered him with submachine gun fire from the living room which he fired thru the connecting wall of the living room and front bedroom and down the hallway.

Carmody fired one round from his .38 caliber revolver as he plunged past the rear bedroom doorway to shelter against a far wall of the dining room.

CEASE-FIRE AGAIN CALLED

Again, Sgt. Groth called out for surrender and a cease-fire and this time, from the rear bedroom, Harold Bell, 23, of Rockford, emerged with his hands in the air. Broderick and Ciszewski, who by then had also jumped over the barricade into the dining room, grabbed Bell and took him to the kitchen where other detectives held him.

But again, gunfire directed at police from the front bedroom broke out and Broderick and Ciszewski fired into both bedrooms from their vantage point in the dining room.

Sgt. Groth called another cease fire and ordered the Panthers to surrender, he said. This time, a voice called from the rear bedroom, "We're coming out. Don't shoot. We've got an injured man back here."

Then Louis Truelock, 39, of 1900 Jackson Blvd., walked out with his hands up, accompanied by Miss Deborah Johnson, 18, of 2337 Monroe St. They, too, were hustled into the kitchen.

DETECTIVE FINDS HAMPTON

Carmody ran into the rear bedroom to find a man, later identified as Hampton, lying face down on the bed with his head facing the bedroom door thru which repeated gunfire had been directed at police in the kitchen.

"He was lying with his arms hanging over the foot of the bed," Carmody said. "On the floor at his right hand was a .45 caliber automatic and at his left a shotgun. I could see he'd been hit, but I didn't know if he was alive or dead. All I knew was that that room was full of shotguns and rifles and ammo."

"So I grabbed him by a wrist and dragged him into the dining room, away from all those guns."

A moment later, as Ciszewski was throwing various weapons out of the back bedroom, he was wounded in his left calf, presumably by a slug fired thru the wall from the front

bedroom directly adjacent. He dived for safety in the kitchen.

Meanwhile, while those in the rear of the flat were surrendering, Sgt. Groth again ordered a cease fire.

"I was virtually pleading with those in the front bedroom to come out," he said. "But again they fired so Broderick fired a shotgun five times into that room from the rear of the hallway. And I kept yelling for them to come out, but there was no response."

Gorman approached the front bedroom door with his submachine gun in his hand.

"I slammed thru that doorway, firing a burst into an open closet I spotted out of the corner of my eye directly to the right inside the door," Gorman said. "I saw two beds with the forms of two people rising between them. One had what looked like a shotgun in his hands he was trying to raise clear of the bed."

"As he started to aim, I fired and the gun fell as he did. The second form kept rising in those few seconds and I fired again after I saw something that looked like a hand gun in the person's hand."

The first person wounded by Gorman proved to be Blair Anderson, 18, of 6943 Justine st. The shotgun he was holding was identified as one stolen from a Chicago police department squad last April 6 in the Chicago avenue police district.

BULLET LODGES IN SHOTGUN

Examination of the weapon showed that a .45 caliber police bullet during the gun battle had penetrated the barrel of the shotgun just a few inches above the breach, jamming it with a live round in the chamber.

The second person wounded by Gorman was Miss Verlina Brewer, 17, of 125 W. 107th st.

As Carmody plunged into the room to join Gorman, Miss Brewer and Anderson cried out, "We give up!"

Then police spotted a third Panther member in the room, Ronald Satchel, 19, of 2337 Monroe st., who also surrendered. He also had been wounded.

In both bedrooms, police found large stores of arms and ammunition. In Hampton's back bedroom, four boxes of shotgun shells were found as well as shotguns, a rifle, and hand guns. Similar caches were in the front bedroom, some of it in a flight bag.

THE BATTLE IS ENDED

With the surrender of the last three Panthers, the battle ended.

Hanrahan said he was making public the detectives' eyewitness accounts because of what he labeled the broad publicity given irresponsible statements by people he said had not been present during the battle.

Charges made by such out-of-state persons as Gary's Mayor Richard G. Hatcher were based on similar charges leveled by such Panther leaders as Bobby Rush, deputy defense minister of the Illinois Panthers, a man who didn't witness the battle either, Hanrahan said.

Hanrahan singled out NBC-TV's Channel 5 in Chicago for having furnished what he charged was a platform for Rush to make irresponsible charges not substantiated by any of the evidence.

"They put Rush on the air before he'd even had time to talk with any of the Panthers present during the battle," Hanrahan said.

"There has been an orgy of sensationalism in the press and on TV that has severely damaged law enforcement and the administration of justice."

THE POSSIBILITIES AND IMPLICATIONS OF A FUTURES MARKET FOR STOCKS

(Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on December 5, the Wall Street Journal carried a lengthy article about plans of the Chicago Board of Trade for the establishment of what, in effect, is a futures market for stocks. The story in the Journal discusses at some length the possibilities and implications of such a market. This matter has been gone into most thoroughly by the board and the well known Washington consulting firm of Robert R. Nathan Associates studied the proposal closely and gave it a favorable report. Since the newspaper article is a most interesting one, I include it in the Record at the end of my remarks.

However, my purpose in calling attention to the plans of the board is not primarily that it may establish a securities market. What I have in mind is to emphasize that this is only one step in a series for revitalization and expansion of the board's activities.

Most of the credit for what I regard as a far seeing and constructive program, goes to the board's president, Henry Hall Wilson. He is a former White House assistant to both President Kennedy and President Johnson, and became the board's head in 1967. Let me briefly outline some of the action which the board has taken since that time. Prior to that time the board offered a futures market for trading in grains and oils and, as I have stated, was the largest commodities exchange in the world. It would have been an easy matter for Mr. Wilson to have proceeded along traditional lines, but instead he has gone outside the field of agriculture. Within the past 18 months, the board has begun trading in three new commodities and two of them, plywood and silver are nonagricultural. The other is iced broiler futures.

I think this venture into commodities outside agriculture is extremely important and shows both imagination and vision. Trading in the grains and to some extent other farm commodities has been hampered on occasion by the operations of the Federal farm programs and the nonrecourse loans which accompany them. At times, the surpluses of wheat, corn and other grains have been so great that the Federal loan actually fixed the price, which then hovered near the loan level. Under such circumstances, the necessity of using the futures market for hedging, a form of price insurance, was greatly lessened.

I do not doubt that there will always be a futures market and a vital one for the agricultural commodities traded in on the board but there is no reason whatever not to diversify and increase the scope of operations. Furthermore, the decline in stock prices has drawn the attention of many investors to the possibilities of the commodities futures market and the results are apparent in increased trading on the board and on other commodity exchanges. One byproduct of this situation is seen in the fact that seats on the board now are selling at around \$40,000 the highest price since the alltime high of \$62,500 in 1929.

Under Henry Hall Wilson the board has taken other significant steps toward modernizing and improving operations.

A special commission of board members has authorized a major study of the economics of transacting and handling business on the exchange.

A complete review of all grain contracts traded in on the exchange with a view to bringing terms and provisions in line with modern economic requirements is in progress.

Board rules have been changed to permit women to become members and several have done so.

The board has created a new department to undertake long-range planning and market development for the exchange.

The board named Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, educator and head of the President's Commission on Violence, Joseph L. Block, industrialists, and Charles L. Schultze, former Director of the Budget, as public directors to help advise on the Exchange's assumption of wider responsibilities for agricultural and trade problems outside the scope of futures trading.

The city of Chicago is proud of the board of trade, which has long been an asset to the entire Midwest, and, in fact, the whole country. In 1967, futures trading on the exchange reached the tremendous volume of slightly more than \$50 billion, or more than two-thirds of all futures trading in the United States.

I have come in contact with Mr. Wilson on quite a few occasions since he became president of the board. I regard him as a dynamic and progressive leader. I feel that under his direction the board will become an increasingly important factor, not only in futures trading, but in leadership which will help deal with many nation's important economic problems.

CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE PUSHES PLANS FOR CENTRAL FUTURES MARKET IN STOCKS

(By Jonathan R. Laing)

CHICAGO.—The Board of Trade is pushing ahead with plans to establish a central marketplace for stock options, those estoric trading devices known to practitioners as puts and calls.

The board, the world's largest mart for trading commodity futures, is formally asking the Securities and Exchange Commission for permission to establish what would amount to a futures market for stocks. The board announced last February that it was contemplating such a move.

The SEC consideration is likely to be lengthy. The Board of Trade, itself, has yet to work out some of the fine details that would have to be submitted for approval. It's unlikely, therefore, that any central option market could be established for at least a year.

Should it come, though, it could open a broad new market for institutional investors eagerly casting about for ways to improve their stock-market performance and hedge their massive portfolios. And it could entice more small traders to the intricacies of option trading, which has been growing in recent years but which still ranks as a gnat when matched against the giant volume of the New York Stock Exchange.

Among institutions that have been attracted to option trading are American General Insurance Co., Houston, and Lincoln Consolidated Inc., the Houston-based holding company for Lincoln Liberty Life Insurance Co., First National Bank of Chicago and Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn., have let it be known they, too, are planning to begin option trading next year.

Other institutions may follow if the Board of Trade establishes its exchange. The treasurer of one large Midwestern university ventures that a market sanctioned by the board "will make options respectable enough for me to go before my trustees and propose that we use endowment money for both writing and buying options."

Still other tax-free institutions say they are holding back only until they can win tax-exempt treatment for profit reaped on options trading.

The profit, or loss, result from speculating which way the price of a stock is likely to head over a stated period of time.

With a call option, a trader acquires the right to buy 100 shares of a stock within a specific period at an agreed "striking price," which usually is at, or near, the market price at the time of the option purchase. For that right he pays a "premium," usually 5% to 20% of the value of the underlying stock.

If the market price of the stock rises above the striking price and the premium paid for the option, the holder profits by buying the shares at the lower striking price and promptly reselling them at the higher market price.

If the market performance falls to meet expectations, however, the option buyer need only allow his rights to expire. His maximum loss is the premium he paid to acquire the option.

PUT OPTION REVERSE

A put option works the other way. Again for a premium ranging from 5% to 20%, the buyer of a put option has the right to sell, or put, 100 shares of a stock within a specific period at an agreed price. He profits when the market price drops enough below the striking price to cover his investment in the option premium. He buys the stock at the cheaper market quote and then resells at the higher option price.

According to one study conducted by the SEC in 1961, the typical option buyer paid a 14% premium to enter the option market. The typical option period, to qualify for treatment as long-term capital gains, was six months and 10 days.

Option sellers customarily have been wealthy individuals, or large securities holders, including, of late, insurance companies and other institutions. They profit on the premiums they receive from the options they sell. And they can profit handsomely if the market's performance discourages option holders from exercising their rights. Such returns can run as high as 40% annually if the option sellers can write a number of options successively on the same shares.

There are hedge advantages, too, in option selling. Because the seller receives a 5% to 20% premium for the option right, be it a put or call, he's protected by that amount whichever way the market turns. If the value of his shares declines, his loss is the decline in paper value of his securities minus the premium received for the option. If the value rises, the option seller has profited at least by the premium received.

Despite the appeal to some speculators, however, turnover in such options has been comparatively light. According to the Put and Call Brokers and Dealers Association, a dealer group, put and call options were written on a total of 30.3 million shares last year. That's up from 23.8 million shares the year before. But the New York Stock Exchange, by contrast, last year traded almost 13 million shares on an average day.

Currently, about 70% of these puts and calls traded in the U.S. are handled by about 20 broker-dealer concerns that deal exclusively in such options. These include Thomas, Haab & Botts, Filer Schmidt & Co., and Godnick & Son Inc. Most are in New York.

TWO STUDIES MADE

The rest of the option volume is handled by such New York Stock Exchange member

firms as Goodbody & Co. and Donaldson Lufkin & Jenrette Inc.

Henry W. Wilson, the Board of Trade's president, first disclosed the exchange's interest at the mart's annual membership meeting last February.

A Washington consulting firm, Robert R. Nathan Associates, gave the proposal a close scrutiny and issued a favorable report. An 11-member independent advisory committee, comprising representatives of the investing and academic worlds, also took a look at the idea and it, too, declared the contemplated market showed a "high promise for improving upon the relatively inefficient market that exists today."

Understandably, many put and call dealers have a different view. "They won't get enough traffic on the few stocks they will list to survive," says Bert Godnick of Godnick & Sons. "Besides, I don't think you can standardize option contracts like the board plans to do."

Lawrence Kotkin of Kotkin Associates, the only publicly held options dealer, predicts that the board's market "will fall flat on its face." He scoffs that "puts and calls are too sophisticated for a bunch of grain traders in Chicago."

SOME 20 STOCKS AT FIRST

As currently envisioned by Board of Trade planners, initially about 20 stocks will be listed on the board. "Our stocks will be high-quality issues which have large share floats outstanding, active trading volume, and price volatility," a board official says.

The contract unit for each option will be 100 shares. For each stock there will be five maturity dates open at all times, with the most distant maturity 15 months away. Options will expire on the fifth from the last business day in January, April, July and October.

There are also a host of market mechanics, rules and surveillance procedures that have to be worked out by the board in conjunction with the SEC. "Our market involves a form of trading that wasn't even contemplated in the 1934 Securities Exchange Act so, no doubt, we have a long road ahead of us with the SEC," a board spokesman says.

One question could be especially delicate: Should options traded on an exchange be individually registered as securities? Board officials are concerned that a ruling requiring registration could hopelessly snarl an options exchange.

The study by Nathan Associates, in advancing the market proposal, contend that a central market for options would remedy a number of defects of the existing market. According to the report, a competitive, auction market would expedite options transactions and would cut costs.

In addition, a central market would result in tighter regulation of options trading and public reporting of transaction prices. Also, the report asserts that a centralized market would have "greater depth and continuity," thus enabling the options market to better accommodate large-block transactions.

Finally, according to the report, the board's proposed market would include a secondary market in which the buyer or seller of an option could liquidate his position at any time prior to the expiration of the option, thus making options more liquid and flexible as investment instruments.

According to the Nathan Associates report, transaction costs would be reduced because of the lower costs of originating and liquidating options. Instead of a dealer spending as long as a week matching up option buyers and sellers, and charging a dealer spread, the central auction market would allow single-step transactions to be struck on the exchange floor.

In addition, the secondary market would allow holders of puts and calls to liquidate option positions without incurring the additional costs of buying or selling the underlying stock.

For the Board of Trade, a market in stock options would recall a day long since past. The board was certified as a stock exchange in 1934 and trading in securities continued, albeit slowly, until the 1950s.

A return to securities dealings also would represent for the board another step in a continuing diversification program. In the past 18 months, the 121-year-old grain-future market has started futures trading in iced broiler chickens, silver and plywood as trading volume slumped in the exchange's primary commodities of corn, wheat and soybeans.

CULTURAL EXPLOSION

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the interesting and exciting events taking place in my home district, and the man responsible for these "happenings."

On an earlier occasion it was my pleasure to report about Allen Parkinson and his imaginative Movieland Wax Museum in Buena Park, Calif. Most men would be content with one outstanding and successful creative expression. Allen Parkinson is a different breed. Mr. Parkinson views his past success as merely a challenge for future endeavors.

His efforts have produced a cultural explosion in southern California. The many hundreds of thousands who have already had the opportunity to see and appreciate Mr. Parkinson's efforts I am sure will agree with me when I say they are both an enriching and entertaining experience.

Some of Mr. Parkinson's more recent endeavors include giving southern Californians a chance to see the Grand Champion Andalusian horse from Spain. He has also added an excellent sea circus to his already creative and exciting Japanese Deer Park.

I am sure I speak for all those who have already enjoyed, and those who will enjoy, Allen Parkinson's Wax Museum, Palace of Living Art, and Japanese Deer Park, when I extend my gratitude to him for making our daily routine a little brighter and a little richer. We are looking forward to the fulfillment of Allen Parkinson's future plans and wish him well in all his efforts.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to add an interesting biographical sketch of Mr. Parkinson. I commend it to all my colleagues in the House.

BIOGRAPHY OF ALLEN PARKINSON

Allen Parkinson is a man who has accomplished what millions of people only dream of doing—he's a man who has achieved phenomenal success by doing something he enjoys personally. What's more, by fulfilling his own dreams and ambitions, he has contributed to the enjoyment and recreation of millions of others.

Parkinson, an entrepreneur of leisure time activity, is the Founder and Director of Movieland Wax Museum, Palace of Living Art and Japanese Village and Deer Park, three of the fastest-growing entertainment attractions in Southern California. All are located in Buena Park and are part of the famous Orange County entertainment belt, which also includes Disneyland and Knott's Berry Farm.

Parkinson was born in Rexburg, Idaho, on January 26, 1919, and was raised in Salt Lake City. He attended high school there and for a short time was enrolled at Utah Agricultural College at Logan. During his school days he became captivated by movies and spent every spare dime to watch films.

Like many people, he became so engrossed in the movie that he almost literally took part in them—he rode wild Arabian stallions with Rudolph Valentino and teetered on skyscraper parapets with Harold Lloyd. But unlike others, who forgot the films shortly after they saw them, he relived them over and over again in his mind.

His favorites were Laurel and Hardy, and he would watch their movies as often and as many times as possible. Beyond that, he liked them all; all the stars of the screen were his friends in his dream world.

After leaving school he was a sample case carrier for a jewelry salesman, then became a full-fledged salesman when his merchandising ideas resulted in orders and continued up the ladder.

In 1939 he joined the U.S. Merchant Marine and served five years, spending much of the time transporting war materials to the Far East.

After the war he took a job as salesman for Mercury Records and worked his way to International Sales Director for the U.S., Canada and Mexico, a position that took him to New York. Disenchanted with New York, he resigned from Mercury and returned to Southern California and a job with Piuma Wines as sales manager.

Parkinson was an insomniac and realized there probably were millions of others who also had sleepless nights. He searched for a formula and developed a product called "Sleep-Eze." He produced it, marketed it and turned it into one of the most successful companies in the pharmaceutical industry. In 1959 he sold it and retired temporarily.

He had experienced travel in his earlier years and now wanted to do so again. He began a series of leisurely trips; and during one of his visits to London, he toured Madame Tussaud's wax museum. It was then that the idea that developed into Movieland Wax Museum struck him. A wax museum would be a welcome attraction in Southern California; but instead of including all kinds of famous people, he would limit it to only movie stars, the ones who had given him so much pleasure during his youth.

He launched a search for wax sculptors. The first one he found in Hong Kong was commissioned to do Laurel and Hardy. Parkinson's own personal favorites. Parkinson supervised the work himself to make certain it was exactly what he wanted.

In 1962, with kleig lights and fireworks, the Movieland Wax Museum was opened in ceremonies not unlike those of the world premiere of the motion picture industry's highest-budgeted films. A star-studded list of celebrities, headed by Mary Pickford, attended the dedication; and the museum was an instant success.

Parkinson then turned toward other endeavors. He had long been an admirer of fine art and had spent many hours touring the great museums of the world. Standing in the Louvre one day, he wondered whether he could create the art he was seeing in dimension to show exactly what the artist must have seen as he was painting or sculpturing his masterpiece.

He immediately envisioned the technique used in his Movieland Wax Museum, and the idea for the Palace of Living Art was born. A building was erected adjacent to Movieland, and 40 of the world's greatest paintings and sculptures were duplicated in authentic replica. Alongside each is sculpted in wax the figure of the model wearing the exact same costume and facial expression that the original model wore.

To see such works of art as the "Mona Lisa," "Blue Boy," "The Last Supper,"

"Venus" and Van Gogh's self-portrait almost breathe with life gives one a new understanding of what the creator of each work was attempting to say or show. Palace of Living Art creates a greater appreciation for art in general; and many who have had only a superficial interest in art prior to their visit have kindled a new interest in finding out more about what they have just seen.

Parkinson had just enjoyed success with the Palace of Living Art when his interests turned in other directions.

He had visited Japan several times and was captivated by the Deer Park in Nara. He returned several times to feed the deer that nuzzled against him and to experience the peace and tranquility of the Deer Park.

He talked with officials of Nara and concluded arrangements whereby Nara would make a gift of deer to him if he would duplicate the Deer Park in California. Parkinson found a 29-acre site near the Movieland Wax Museum, started construction on a Deer Park and immediately found the concept growing into an entire Japanese Village.

Today it is the largest Japanese cultural and recreational center in the Western Hemisphere; it is still growing. A 2,500-seat aquatheater was recently completed surrounding a 2 million gallon sea waterway; and a complete sea circus with dolphins, sea lions and water clowns perform regularly.

Thirteen bears were a gift of the Nabori Betsu Bear Gardens in Hokkaido, the northernmost island in Japan; and two of them play basketball. They pick the ball up between their paws, take careful aim and toss a shot at the rim. They hit an unusually high percentage of shots, too.

A pool of seals, gifts from Sapporo, also on Hokkaido, greets visitors as they enter the Village; and black swans and golden carp from the City of Ube glide through the many lagoons within the Village. Japanese architecture prevails. All employees wear traditional and authentic Japanese costumes. A tea house serves Japanese and American food, and Japanese music plays throughout the Village.

The Village now has more than 200 deer, and visitors to the Deer Park take delight in feeding them as they stroll through the sunken deer compound. White dove in a special walk-through pavilion also eat out of guests' hands.

What's next for Parkinson? He plans to continue expanding the Japanese Village. There are many more aspects of Japanese culture he wants to bring to this country, and his long-range plans call for full utilization of the 29 acres.

Not everyone can visit the Orient personally, he says; and if the Japanese Village can give its visitors the feeling of having actually been in Japan, even if for only a few hours, its purpose will have been fulfilled.

As long as Allen Parkinson keeps finding things that he enjoys, the American public will continue to benefit.

STATEMENT OF POSITION OF THE NATIONAL SKEET SHOOTING ASSOCIATION

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the National Skeet Shooting Association has rendered valuable service to law-abiding sportsmen's groups and to legitimate anticrime proposals. This organization has been a leader in the efforts to provide sound programs by helping to make needed facts on these important subjects available to the public. Recently, the organization has prepared a statement of posi-

tion which I am pleased indeed to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the Congress:

STATEMENT OF POSITION OF THE NATIONAL SKEET SHOOTING ASSOCIATION

Few domestic problems are causing such great concern as the skyrocketing incidence of lawlessness and armed crime in this Nation. While the impact of increasing crime is primarily felt in the major urban areas, it is not confined to any one State or locality. And, whenever armed crime is discussed, the subject of "gun controls" as a solution to it almost invariably arises.

At the outset this Association submits that the term and concept of "gun controls" is a misplaced one. What we should be talking about is "crime control," for it is the misuse of firearms in crime, by persons who have no regard for the rights of others, not the lawful ownership of firearms for self-defense or lawful sporting purposes, which is causing the concern to this Nation. It is the criminal and socially irresponsible element, not the law abiding—which should be curtailed.

In this regard, our Association wishes to make crystal clear one point: Virtually, every law-abiding citizen owning a firearm, including those in this Association, shares an overriding desire to reduce armed crime and senseless death from dangerous instruments. No dollar cost is too high; human suffering and lives cannot be measured in dollars. Those who legitimately own and use firearms are outraged over their misuse by the irresponsible and criminal element; it is unfair to represent them as callous to crime or interested only in their inconvenience. If this association believed that the currently advertised panacea of "gun controls"—that is, the registration of all firearms and the licensing of their owners—was a reasonable and effective crime deterrent, it would then support them. It does not. It believes there are far better ways to curtail armed crime and senseless death from dangerous instruments, such as firearms. It is in this vein that this association offers its recommendations for the control of armed crime:

First: Stiff minimum mandatory penalties should be imposed (by the States as well as the Federal Government) for crimes committed with deadly weapons, including firearms. For the first conviction, there should be a minimum sentence of not less than one year nor more than fifteen years, with right of parole and judicial discretion to suspend the sentence (for here we may be dealing with someone other than a habitual criminal), for the second conviction there should be a minimum sentence from fifteen years to thirty years without right of parole or suspension or probation of sentence; for the third conviction a minimum of thirty years to maximum of life, without right of parole or suspension or probation of sentence. These sentences should be *in addition to*, and *not concurrent with*, any sentence imposed for the crime. And, most importantly, our judicial and prosecutorial machinery should be expedited to bring about the swift administration of justice.

Studies reveal that a large percentage of armed crime is committed by habitual criminals and repeaters. A prime deterrent to the habitual criminal is the fear of spending actual time in prison or subject to correctional authorities. With a minimum sentence law on the books of our States and Federal Government the habitual criminal will think twice before he engages in armed crime. At the very minimum, we can remove him from lawful society.

Second: Bail should be automatically revoked for any criminal who has in his possession a deadly weapon while awaiting trial for a serious felony. Similarly parole should be revoked where the parolee is transporting or carrying a weapon. Studies have shown

there is a relatively high incidence of the commission of armed crime by a criminal while he is out on bail awaiting trial, or while he is on parole after having been convicted and serving a part of his jail term for earlier crimes.

Third: A substantial bail should be required in all felonies involving the carrying or use of a dangerous weapon. Our present bail system has been too soft with criminals accused of committing armed crimes. Again we should have a sliding scale which makes it progressively more expensive for repeat offenders to make bail. Those who habitually commit crimes with deadly weapons are dangerous to society—they should not be allowed to roam freely about upon nominal bail or personal recognizance.

Fourth: We should pass laws, patterned after the *Federal Firearms Act of 1933* which make it illegal, *per se*, for drug addicts, lunatics and convicted felons to transport or carry about firearms or other similar dangerous weapons. A disproportionately high incidence of crimes with deadly weapons is committed either by (1) persons addicted to or under the influence of drugs, or (2) persons who have been previously convicted of felonies. Certainly this element, which is unstable at best, and criminally vicious at worst, should not be allowed to transport or carry about dangerous weapons.

Instead of trying to achieve this goal in an indirect way by licensing the law-abiding and registering the firearm of the law-abiding, the burden should be placed squarely where it belongs—on the lawless and unstable. Provision should be made, however, for permission to be granted by an appropriate public official to allow a truly reformed felon, a cured addict or a person recovered from a mental disease, who has demonstrated his reliability and usefulness to society, to own and use sporting weapons.

Fifth: Firearms safety and hunting safety courses for our population should be encouraged. The States requiring completion of hunter safety courses have shown a marked decrease in hunting accidents. There is no reason why firearms accidents in the home cannot also be curtailed by such programs.

Sixth: We oppose the registration of firearms and the licensing of their owners—(sometimes referred to as an identification card system). At last estimate there were some 200 million firearms in this Nation, mostly rifles and shotguns. The overwhelming majority of these are lawfully owned and responsibly used. Some 50 million sales or exchanges of firearms occur each year—again virtually all between honorable citizens. Neither these people nor their firearms constitute any danger to society and they should not be regulated as if they were potential criminals.

On the other hand, it is just plain foolishness to expect that the felons, assassins, paranoids and other social misfits who should not own guns will step forward to turn in their weapons or incriminate themselves under any such registration and licensing laws. If this class of miscreants believed in law and order, we would not have a crime problem. Indeed, the Supreme Court has ruled that such undesirables cannot be compelled to come forward to incriminate themselves.

The evidence from the jurisdictions having both registration laws and licensing laws (Washington, D.C.; Chicago, Ill., and San Francisco, Calif.) has revealed no significant reduction of crime has occurred. To the contrary, armed crime has increased in those jurisdictions. Similarly, the majority of the jurisdictions having either an I.D. card law (e.g. Massachusetts, Illinois and New Jersey) or pure gun registration laws have experienced no reduction in crime. In short, these programs have been costly failures (for the criminals simply ignored them) as anti-crime measures. There have been, however, numerous reports of unjustified oppression of law-abiding citizens by over zealous governmental authorities administering such laws.

Moreover, the cost of registering the lawful firearms and licensing their owners, and monitoring the lawful transactions is staggering. It would run into billions, and would force the creation of another huge governmental bureaucracy. We would far prefer these billions spent on slum clearance, job programs for the underprivileged, more and better police, better jail systems and similar projects which have a proven history as a deterrent to crime.

In conclusion, we stress that we, in this Association, are not afraid of identifying ourselves, we are not ashamed of our sport or of our love of the outdoors. Since our sport began we have stressed the importance of safety and individual responsibility in the ownership and use of firearms. We, too, are deeply concerned over rising armed crime. But, on the evidence thus far presented, we simply do not believe that a multi-billion dollar anti-gun registration-licensing program aimed at the law-abiding will have any real impact in deterring armed crime or reducing violent deaths. Our Association believes there are far more effective ways to curtail armed crime and armed violence without resorting to regulation of the law-abiding. As the French proverb says: "If poverty is the mother of crime, then want of sense is its father" (Jean de la Bruyere, 1688).

OMEGA PSI PHI OUTSTANDING CITIZEN OF THE YEAR—THE HONORABLE SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Omega Psi Phi fraternity for its annual sponsorship of National Achievement Week, which was observed by chapters throughout the Nation from November 2 to November 9.

The purpose of National Achievement Week, during which the presentation of Omega Psi Phi Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award is made, is to give recognition to outstanding persons in public life whose outstanding achievement and service to the country have been exemplary to others.

Also during National Achievement Week, awards are made to high school seniors who have written the best essays in a contest which tests their creative writing ability on contemporary problems. This year's topic was "Student Protest And Revolt—Helpful or Harmful?" The authors of the two most thoughtful and best written entries will receive scholarships to the colleges of their choice; and there is a \$500 first prize and a \$200 second prize.

The Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award is made to nationally prominent persons in private and public life. The award has been given in the past to such leading citizens as the late Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; Senator EDWARD BROOKE; Chief Judge William Hastie, the first black judge to sit on the Federal bench; Robert Weaver, the former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Benjamin Mays, president of Morehouse College; George Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs; Dr. James Nabrit, president of Howard University.

This year, the award was presented to Congresswoman SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, who represents the 12th District of New York. Mrs. CHISHOLM is the first black woman

to serve in the U.S. Congress, and her service in the House of Representatives has been characterized by the same devotion and determination as her previous work in public service.

Her concern for the problems of the people of her district and of all disadvantaged Americans is untiring. She has brought to the House the qualities of courage, hard work, and dedication which bring credit to the House, her constituents, and to the Nation.

Her choice as Omega Psi Phi's outstanding citizen of the year is certainly deserved. Her contributions to public service should inspire young Americans from all walks of life to serve their fellow citizens through civic responsibility.

JOHN P. COLLINS, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN IRISH NATIONAL IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE, URGES FAIR IMMIGRATION

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, John P. Collins, national chairman of the American Irish National Immigration Committee, appeared before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Judiciary Committee to testify on experience under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. He was accompanied by representatives of chapters of the American Irish National Immigration Committee from all across the Nation—from New York to San Francisco, including Chicago and Dayton in the heartland of America, all of which have urged Congress to act to overcome unanticipated and inequitable effects of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965.

John Collins is no stranger to the subcommittee for he made an equally eloquent statement before it on July 3, 1968—3 days after the 1965 act went fully into effect.

Almost 2 years ago, I introduced legislation in the 90th Congress to make additional visas available to nationals of those countries where the average immigration had sharply declined as a result of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act.

This year, on the opening day of Congress, I again introduced this legislation as H.R. 165. Seventy-seven Members of the House are either cosponsors of the bill, or its companion bills, or have introduced identical bills. A list of sponsors will be appended at the conclusion of my remarks.

H.R. 165 makes sure that no nation would suffer a severe reduction in its level of immigration to the United States as a result of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. The bill provides that a "floor" would be established for every nation, based on its average level of immigration to the United States during the decade prior to the enactment of the 1965 act; that is, during the years 1956 through 1965. The floor would in no way be based on the former quota, but only on the actual

numbers which came in during these years. The bill provides a floor equivalent to 75 percent of the annual average level of immigration during the 1956-65 base period, or 10,000 individuals, whichever is less. To the extent that immigration falls below the floor for a given fiscal year, extra numbers of visa spaces—above and independent of the worldwide quota—would be provided the following year, so that total immigration reaches the established floor.

I wish to emphasize again that H.R. 165 is not in any way a return to the old national origins quota system—which quite properly was abolished in 1965.

Under the 1965 act, however, the immigration preferences are drawn in such a way that much of the potential immigration from Western European countries cannot meet the qualifications of various categories, particularly those involving labor certification. This is no more equitable than the national origins quota system, which screened out people from sections of the world such as Africa and Asia.

In the case of Ireland, which sent an average of 7,000 immigrants during the base period 1956-65, about 5,300 places, or 75 percent of the base period average, would be established as the floor for Irish immigration. No country whose immigration levels had improved as a result of the 1965 act would be adversely affected.

As predicted, Irish immigration has continued to decline. In fiscal year 1969, only 538 preference and nonpreference visas were issued in Dublin to immigrants born in Ireland. Yet, in 1965, when the new Immigration and Nationality Act was being considered in the Congress, the Department of State assured Congress that under its provisions Ireland would be able to qualify for approximately 5,200 places per year. If the State Department projections had been accurate, it would not be necessary to take remedial action.

The need for corrective action is apparent. H.R. 165 would effectively achieve that corrective action. The widespread support for this legislation evidenced by the fact that there are 77 cosponsors makes it also apparent that many Members of Congress are concerned that remedial action be taken. H.R. 165, by correcting the deficiencies in the present law, would insure continuance of new seed immigration, not only from Ireland, but from every other nation which has suffered a decline as a result of the 1965 act. It would equalize our immigration policy, the imbalances of which have produced the precipitous decline.

So that my colleagues will understand the need for prompt congressional action, I include at this point in the RECORD the very persuasive, and ably presented, testimony of John P. Collins, national chairman of the American Irish National Immigration Committee:

STATEMENT BY JOHN P. COLLINS

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Members of the Congress,

One year ago we appeared before this Committee to offer testimony on Irish experience under the 1965 U.S. Immigration and Na-

tionality Act. If we were to briefly sum up what that experience has been, we would have to say it has been a tale of shock and sadness.

On October 3, 1965, the new U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act was signed into law by the President of the United States. It was signed in New York Harbor on Liberty Island beneath the Statue of Liberty. The Emma Lazarus inscription on the base of the statue reads partially—

"Give us your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. . . ."

This inscription seems very odd indeed today, when we realize that for the first time in U.S. history, the doors of this nation have been effectively shut to the Irish. This is sad indeed when we contemplate all that Ireland has contributed to our nation in the arts, sciences, religion, government, business, labor and sports.

In a little known speech delivered by George Washington's adopted son, Custis, at the city hall, Washington, D.C., on June 20, 1826, he declared: "When our friendless standard was first unfurled for resistance, who were the strangers that first mustered round its staff, and when it reeled in the fight, who more bravely sustained it than Erin's generous sons? . . . I cap the climax of their worth, when I say, Washington loved them, for they were the companions of his toils, his glories, in the deliverance of his country."

The part the Irish played in the American Revolution was told in the Irish House of Commons on April 2, 1784, by Luke Gardner, when he said: "America was lost to England by Irish emigrants."

The major part of George Washington's army was composed of Irish, and the Irish language was as commonly spoken in the American ranks as English. It was their valor determined the conquest.

Well might Lord Mountjoy have declared in the British Parliament: "You have lost America by the Irish." We all know of the magnificent work done on sea by Commodore John Barry, Father of the American Navy. That brilliant Irishman, Richard Montgomery, was the first American General to fall.

Matthew Thornton, James Smith, and George Taylor—all Irish born—signed the Declaration of Independence and five other signers were of Irish blood, namely Edward Rutledge, Thomas Lynch, Thomas McKean, George Reed and Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

Andrew Jackson, "Old Hickory," the first American President who rose from the rank and file was the son of an Irish exile. Another typical Irishman, "equally great in peace and war," was General James Shields. He was the hero of two wars—the Mexican War and the Civil War—a Judge of the Illinois Supreme Court, a Governor of Oregon and Senator from three States. The terrible famine in Ireland in 1846-47 sent hosts of Irishmen to this country, and it is not too much to say that had they not come our Union would have been rent in twain by the Civil War. They and their sons fought heroically to save the Union in the thickest of the wilderness, at the bloody battle of Gettysburg, on the crimsoned field of Chancellorsville and elsewhere. Who can tell the services to America of Sheridan, O'Brien, Meagher, Corcoran, Mulligan, Ford, Meade, Coppinger, and Trilley.

In the battle of Antietam the bloodiest one battle of the Civil War, the Sixty-ninth Regiment, New York Volunteers, Meagher's Irish Brigade lost in killed and wounded 61.8 percent. For more than two hundred years the Irish have been among the pathfinders and builders of the American Nation.

If the handiwork of the Irish were painted green, the average American city would be splashed in all sides with emerald hues. Yet

there are few who are aware of this. A New Yorker for example, may rise in the morning, bathe in water that comes from Croton Dam, built by James Coleman, then take the subway, built by John B. McDonald, pass the College of the City of New York, built by Thomas Dwyer and then Cable to Alaska over a line laid by David Lynch.

It is safe to say that all that the Irish have done for America has never been fully told. As Americans of Irish blood, we are proud of our ancestors and proud too that it was through their efforts that this country became the most prosperous country in the world, but despite these facts we now find that the restrictive new immigration law has drastically reduced the issuance of immigration visas to Irishmen. I ask the committee as a newspaper in New York recently asked, "Are their deeds forgotten?"

Certainly the 1965 U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act in its effect on Ireland does not demonstrate the thanks of a grateful nation. In its effect the present 1965 U.S. Immigration Law is neither fair nor just to Ireland but is beggarly and miserly.

IS THERE A PROBLEM

We were told in 1966, that no problem existed. Then in 1967, we were told by the Labor Department, that the problem laid with the Congress and by the Congress that it laid with the Labor Department. Finally, the State Department admitted that there was a problem and so informed the Congress. The Congress replied that it would solve itself within the three year adjustment period. Of course Ireland did not adjust. Now we are told by some, wait another year—Ireland will adjust and by others that there is no problem at all. Well we've come the full circle, haven't we. We reply that Ireland will not adjust because it cannot adjust under the terms of a law which prevents adjustment. One year ago we made the projection before this very committee that less than 500 Irish would receive preference and non-preference visas in Dublin during fiscal year 1969. We were not very far from wrong. 538 received such visas.

ONE YEAR LATER

Before 1965, 5,000 to 7,000 Irish came here each year. In fiscal year 1969, under the new law only 1,407 Irish entered the U.S. As best we could, we explained the problem to you last year and our testimony is a matter of record. We come here today at your invitation not only to affirm what we have already said but also to offer the firm hand of cooperation.

We now know that the Irish immigration situation is far from better one year later. And I can assure you that if these invitations to testify continue to be on a yearly basis, no year will come when the Irish immigration situation will be solved if no legislation is forthcoming.

THE PROBLEM OF DISCRIMINATION

No one can deny that many nationalities were the victims of discrimination as a result of past U.S. Immigration policy. We know that many nationalities had no quotas or small quotas which were consistently over-subscribed while Ireland had a large quota which for the most part went unused. However, neither Ireland nor the American Irish asked for the quota.

The law was changed in 1965 to provide equality for all. On its face the law does this and I'm sure we all remember those famous State Department statistics of 1965 which assured you that the law would be fair to Ireland in allowing in over 5,000 persons to enter each year. But we also know now that the law, however, well intentioned it was, is far from fair in its effect on Ireland and some other nations.

THE REASONS

The new immigration law eliminated the national origins quotas, promoted the reuniting of families and protected American

labor with a few strokes of the pen. Each of these aims is good and is worthy of our support.

Ireland, England and Germany enjoyed a privileged position in U.S. immigration prior to 1965 partially because of the number of immigrants contributed by them in earlier years. Now all nations will have to compete equally for U.S. immigration numbers. This is good, except that the terms for competition are fairer to some nations than they are to others.

It is now evident that when the new law was drafted, there was a failure to anticipate the effect that the new law would have on the formerly so called "privileged countries" and in particular Ireland. Overlooked was the sociological pattern of immigration in these countries and the history of the country's immigration.

THE FAMILIAL PREFERENCES

The new law provides for a system of preferences based on family relationship and skills. These are of little help to Ireland, while they are of much help, particularly the family relationship preferences to other nations.

Ireland's immigrants to the U.S. have traditionally been of the non-preference unskilled variety. Had the present law been in effect some years ago, many of the members of the Congress would not be present in the U.S. today. Analyzing Irish families, one finds that a few brothers and sisters from the family emigrate while others remain at home. The mother and father remain at home. The Irish emigrant is generally young, unmarried and hence brings no spouse or children. It is the rare case in recent times when a whole Irish family emigrates to the U.S. Thus Ireland's sociological pattern of immigration does not permit it to compete equally with some other nationalities for family preferences.

THE PROFESSIONAL PREFERENCES

In fiscal year 1969 under the new law only 122 Irishmen qualified for a visa preference as a professional or a needed skilled worker.

This is in part due to training and to economy of the country. In this area Ireland is the hardest hit of the three formerly "privileged countries".

Thus these two preferences, the third and the sixth, are of little help to Ireland. Of course, it may well be better that professionals and skilled workers remain at home in Ireland as in any technologically developing nation.

SECTION 212(A) (14)

The majority of Ireland's contribution of immigrants has always been in the unskilled labor area and will continue to be. They came here to better their lives economically and in turn hopefully they bettered the nation. We know that they contributed heavily to the independence and security of this nation down to this very day in Vietnam.

Until December 1965, the Irish unskilled immigrant had little trouble in entering the U.S. He or she could enter unless the Secretary of Labor said no. Now under the revised Section 212(a) (14) the immigrant can't enter unless the Secretary of Labor says yes. American Irish long active in labor unions as well as all Americans are desirous of protecting American labor and want to see no American worker put out of a job as the result of any immigrant coming into the U.S. But is Section 212(a) (14) necessary in its present form and is it accomplishing its intended purpose? We think not.

Immigrants add but a tiny fraction to the total U.S. labor force, so our government officials tell us. In fiscal year 1968, 58,954 of the total U.S. immigrants were of the non-preference variety. This is certainly a small number considering that close on 34,000 American born workers enter the labor force every four days. At the same time up to

153,000 immigrants in the preference categories can come into the U.S. each year and are free of any labor restrictions. They can take any job they want and put any American worker out of a job. The law seems overconcerned with the small remainder. This small remainder must comply with Section 212(a) (14). New seed immigration is being eliminated and the U.S. will be the loser.

SCHEDULES A, B, AND C

The jobs that the Irish traditionally took when they came here are on Schedule B, the prohibited entry list. One can seriously question whether there is an actual nationwide oversupply of workers of all jobs listed on Schedule B. One can also question the method and procedure by which such jobs come to be listed on this schedule. Certainly supply and demand for jobs may vary from locality to locality and from time to time. It can now be clearly demonstrated that the jobs listed on Schedules A and C are not by any means the sole ones for which there is a demand for workers.

THE DEFINITE JOB OFFER REQUIREMENT

The obvious truth is that employers do not want to hire workers sight unseen. Our country was built with new seed immigration—individuals who had no close relatives here but who were willing to come here and work hard for a better life. If an applicant desires to come here and work in a job category which has no oversupply of workers, then he should not be required to do the impossible to find an employer who will hire him sight unseen.

Three out of the five reasons given by the U.S. Embassy, Dublin for the decline in immigrant visas issued, dealt with the definite job offer requirement, labor schedules and labor certification. "... there is no doubt that Section 212(a) (14) of the Act has caused a decrease in Irish immigration to the United States. As many Irish visa applicants are unskilled or semi-skilled workers, they are unable to qualify under Section 212(a) (14) as amended."

Over two years ago we demonstrated to the staff of this Subcommittee and to the various government agencies that the bulk of prospective Irish immigrants were of the non-preference variety and would always be so. We were told at the time that the reason for this was that under the quota system the Irish never had need to use the preferences but that that would all change in due time. Mr. Chairman, in fiscal year 1968 out of 3,561 Irish visas issued 2,730 were still of the non-preference variety. In fiscal year 1969 out of 538 visas issued in Ireland, 220 were of the non-preference variety. There has been no change. Those are the government's statistics not ours.

How many more Irish want to come but cannot? They have few relatives here, they have no special skills, they have some education. They are similar to my father and mother and to the fathers and mothers of many members of my committee and of this Congress. They're the kind of people that helped found this nation and they're the kind of people that were once allowed into the U.S.

Irish men and women want to come here but they can't. Instead to England, Canada and Australia they are going. We say they should have the right to come here the same as any other nationality. Evidence that they want to come won't be found by making a short visit to Ireland or by sitting in the American Embassy in Dublin, the Consul's office in Belfast, a government minister's office or on the streets of Dublin. But if you want demonstration of the fact that the Irish want to come, I'll be glad to accompany any of you to parts of County Mayo, Galway, Cork, Kerry, Leitrim, Dcnegal and parts of occupied Ireland where you will get that evidence.

Something must be done, Mr. Chairman. Action must be taken.

THE CHALLENGE

I believe that every one of you agrees that a solution must be found. Over two years ago Congressman William Ryan came forward with a solution now embodied in H.R. 165.

Simply explained, it places a "floor" on immigration from each country. This "floor" would be equal to 75 per cent of a country's annual average immigration during the 10 year period 1955 to 1965 with a maximum floor limit of 10,000 for any country. In the case of Ireland, this number would be 5,390; for example, if in 1969, 1,000 Irish immigrated under the present—under the new formula an additional 4,390 Irishmen could immigrate to the United States in 1970 and they would not be subject to the present labor restrictions.

Seventy-eight Congressmen have co-sponsored this bill. They came from both political parties and many different political persuasions. They regard it as do a number of labor unions as a fair solution and so do we. If enacted it would provide a fair U.S. immigration law for the nation.

Our problem is one that requires a permanent solution. Those many other bills pending which provide only a temporary answer are of no merit. Stopgap legislation is no answer. One other bill H.R. 13999 must be considered, that offered by yourself, Mr. Chairman. In that it offers a permanent solution, it has merit. However this modest proposal offers questionable and at most minimal benefits in comparison to the Ryan bill which we prefer.

OUR COMMITTEE

From Boston to San Francisco, from New York to Los Angeles, from Cleveland to Hartford, our committee exists. It is composed of representatives of every major Irish organization in the United States. It consists of Irish born and American born men and women, Protestant, Catholic and Jew, government leaders, clergymen, businessmen, union leaders and ordinary individuals who have been the backbone of this country. They are present here today and available for testimony should you desire to hear them.

Our committee is in existence for one purpose only, to right a wrong, to preserve the right of the Irish to enter the U.S. not to encourage Irish immigration and certainly not to deny other nations the right to come here. To the chagrin of many it is still in existence and I assure all it will be until justice is achieved.

Our heritage tells us that we're children of a fighting race that's never yet known disgrace and we represent that heritage and the interests of generations of Irishmen, some yet unborn. The claim of these Irishmen on the U.S. was once spelled out by John Boyle O'Reilly, a great civil libertarian, a great American, a great Irishman when he said:

"No treason do we bring from Erin
Nor bring we shame nor guilt
The sword we hold may be broken
But we haven't dropped the hilt.

"The wreath we offer to Columbia
is fastened of thorns not bought
And the hearts we bring are saddened
by the thoughts of sorrowful days.
But the hearts we bring for freedom
are washed in a people's faith
outliving a thousand years."

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress, we believe we're entitled to a better day and a better law. We regard each of you distinguished members of the Congress as being

sympathetic to the plight of the prospective Irish immigrant. We beg you now to channel that sympathy into an effective solution.

CHART NO. 1—IRISH IMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED
(By fiscal year, July to June)

	Total	Portion of that total issued in Dublin
Old law 1962	5,345	4,076
Old law 1963	6,237	4,618
Old law 1964	6,328	4,914
Old law 1965	5,378	4,232
Old law 1966 (July to November)	2,375	1,979
New law 1966 (December to June)	696	1,585
Total 1966	3,071	2,564 2,204
New law 1967	2,665	1,120 2,203
New law 1968	3,619	2,764
New law 1969	1,407	795

¹ U.S. Embassy.
² Visa Office.

NOTE.—A discrepancy exists between the figures issued by U.S. Embassy and Visa Office.

Source: Statistics provided by Visa Office, U.S. State Department and U.S. Embassy, Dublin.

CHART NO. 2.—IMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED AT DUBLIN TO ALIENS BORN IN IRELAND FISCAL YEAR 1969

1st preference	6
2d preference	58
3d preference	11
4th preference	11
5th preference	188
6th preference	55
7th preference	220
Nonpreference	538
Total	538
Immediate relatives	130
Special immigrants	127
Special legislation	—
Grand total	795

CHART NO. 3.—VISAS ISSUED, CONDITIONAL ENTRIES AND ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS GRANTED IMMIGRANTS BORN IN IRELAND, FISCAL YEAR 1969

	Visas issued	Conditional entries and adjustment of status	Total
1st preference	18	2	20
2d preference	74	23	97
3d preference	2	—	2
4th preference	15	—	15
5th preference	314	102	416
6th preference	75	45	120
7th preference	—	—	—
Nonpreference	297	27	324
Total	795	199	994
Immediate relatives	245	—	245
Special immigrants	168	—	168
Special legislation	—	—	—
Grand total	1,208	199	1,407

I include at this point in the RECORD the list of the sponsors of H.R. 165 or identical bills in the 91st Congress:

SPONSORS OF H.R. 165

- Joseph P. Addabbo of New York.
- Frank Annunzio of Illinois.
- William A. Barrett of Pennsylvania.
- Mario Biaggi of New York.
- Jonathan Bingham of New York.
- Edward P. Boland of Massachusetts.
- Frank T. Bow of Ohio.
- Frank J. Brasco of New York.
- James A. Burke of Massachusetts.
- Phillip Burton of California.
- Daniel E. Burton of New York.
- James A. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

- Hugh L. Carey of New York.
- Jeffery Cohelan of California.
- Harold R. Collier of Illinois.
- Dominick V. Daniels of New Jersey.
- James J. Delaney of New York.
- John H. Dent of Pennsylvania.
- Edward Derwinski of Illinois.
- Harold Donohue of Massachusetts.
- Thaddeus Dulski of New York.
- Leonard Farbstein of New York.
- Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey.
- Samuel N. Friedel of Maryland.
- James G. Fulton of Pennsylvania.
- Cornelius E. Gallagher of New Jersey.
- Robert N. Giaimo of Connecticut.
- Jacob Gilbert of New York.
- Henry Gonzalez of Texas.
- William Green of Pennsylvania.
- James R. Grover of New York.
- Seymour Halpern of New York.
- Margaret M. Heckler of Massachusetts.
- Henry Helstoski of New Jersey.
- Charles S. Joelson of New Jersey.
- John C. Kluczynski of Illinois.
- Edward I. Koch of New York.
- Clarence D. Long of Maryland.
- Allard K. Lowenstein of New York.
- Torbert Macdonald of Massachusetts.
- Richard McCarthy of New York.
- Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania.
- Martin B. McKneally of New York.
- Ray J. Madden of Indiana.
- Thomas J. Meskill of Connecticut.
- Abner Mikva of Illinois.
- Joseph G. Minish of New Jersey.
- John S. Monagan of Connecticut.
- John M. Murphy of New York.
- William T. Murphy of Illinois.
- Robert N. C. Nix of Pennsylvania.
- Thomas P. O'Neill of Massachusetts.
- Richard L. Ottinger of New York.
- Edward J. Patten of New Jersey.
- Philip J. Philbin of Massachusetts.
- Otis Pike of New York.
- Bertram Podell of New York.
- Adam C. Powell of New York.
- Roman Pucinski of Illinois.
- Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin.
- Ogden Reid of New York.
- Daniel J. Ronan of Illinois.
- Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York.
- William F. Ryan of New York.
- Fernand St Germain of Rhode Island.
- William St. Onge of Connecticut.
- Charles W. Sandman, Jr., of New Jersey.
- William Stanton of Ohio.
- Robert Taft of Ohio.
- Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey.
- Robert O. Tiernan of Rhode Island.
- Joseph Viorito of Pennsylvania.
- Lowell P. Weicker of Connecticut.
- Charles W. Whalen, Jr., of Ohio.
- Lester L. Wolf of New York.
- John W. Wydler of New York.
- Gus Yatron of Pennsylvania.

I also include in the RECORD certain statistical tables which were submitted to me by the Department of State:

VISAS ISSUED AT DUBLIN FISCAL YEAR 1969

	Ireland born	Born elsewhere	Total
1st preference	6	—	6
2d preference	58	67	125
3d preference	—	1	1
4th preference	11	5	16
5th preference	188	19	207
6th preference	55	67	122
7th preference	—	—	—
Nonpreference	220	23	243
Total	538	182	720
Immediate relatives	130	114	244
Special immigrants	127	21	148
Grand total	795	317	1,112

IMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED AT DUBLIN TO APPLICANTS BORN OUTSIDE IRELAND, FISCAL YEAR 1969

Immediate relatives:	
Australia	1
Bulgaria	1
China	15
Great Britain	17
Greece	61
Hungary	1
Indonesia	1
Italy	10
Malaysia	1
Norway	1
Portugal	2
South Africa	1
Spain	2
Total	114
Special immigrants:	
Argentina	1
Canada	3
Ceylon	1
Great Britain	9
Greece	2
Malta	1
New Zealand	2
Portugal	1
Spain	1
Total	21
Preference and nonpreference:	
China	70
Germany	1
Great Britain	35
Greece	35
Hungary	1
India	6
Italy	7
Malaysia	1
Poland	1
Portugal	1
South Africa	1
Tanzania	2
United Arab Republic	1
Yugoslavia	20
Total	182

VISAS ISSUED AND ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS GRANTED IMMIGRANTS BORN IN IRELAND, FISCAL YEAR 1969

	Visas issued	Adjustment of status	Total
1st preference	6	2	8
2d preference	86	23	109
3d preference	2	2	4
4th preference	15	1	16
5th preference	314	102	416
6th preference	75	45	120
7th preference			
Nonpreference	297	27	324
Total	795	199	994
Immediate relatives	245	(1)	245
Special immigrants	168	(1)	168
Special legislation			
Grand total	1,208	199	1,407

¹ Since adjustments of such applicants are not subject to the numerical controls exercised by the Department of State, the figures are available only from the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to congratulate President Nixon on the splendid message he sent to Congress December 10, "expressing the American spirit," concerning the role of the arts and humanities in the life of our country.

I believe that the President's statement represents a most constructive and encouraging response to the Nation's need for greater support of our cultural resources.

As chairman of the Select Education

Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, with jurisdiction over the legislation which authorizes the Arts and Humanities Foundation, I was particularly pleased to see that President Nixon has called for approval by Congress of \$40 million in new funds for the National Foundation in fiscal year 1971, virtually double the level of funding for the current year.

The President's message reflects an awareness of the crucial role that the arts and humanities play in American life, and I share the President's conviction that, in his words, "the attention and support we give arts and the humanities—especially as they affect our young people—represent a vital part of our commitment to enhancing the quality of life for all Americans."

I am particularly gratified, Mr. Speaker, that the President in his message has drawn attention to the grave financial plight of museums and symphony orchestras, and that he has also expressed his concern about the need to redress the imbalance between the sciences and the humanities.

I would like as well, Mr. Speaker, to observe that State arts councils are becoming much more active as a result of the Federal arts program and to note that for each Federal dollar, States have come up with \$3 from local, State, and private contributions to arts programs.

I was pleased today to join the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES), in cosponsoring the bill recommended by the President, which extends the life of the National Arts and Humanities Foundation over 3 years beyond the present expiration date of June 30, 1970. I have consulted with the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), who has been a most effective champion of the arts and humanities programs, and we intend to begin hearings on the bill shortly after the start of the session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert the text of President Nixon's message to Congress on the arts and humanities:

EXPRESSING THE AMERICAN SPIRIT

Americans have long given their first concerns to the protection and enhancement of Life and Liberty; we have reached the point in our history when we should give equal concern to "the Pursuit of Happiness."

This phrase of Jefferson's, enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, is defined today as "the quality of life." It encompasses a fresh dedication to protect and improve our environment, to give added meaning to our leisure and to make it possible for each individual to express himself freely and fully.

The attention and support we give the arts and the humanities—especially as they affect our young people—represent a vital part of our commitment to enhancing the quality of life for all Americans. The full richness of this nation's cultural life need not be the province of relatively few citizens centered in a few cities; on the contrary, the trend toward a wider appreciation of the arts and a greater interest in the humanities should be strongly encouraged, and the diverse cul-

ture of every region and community should be explored.

America's cultural life has been developed by private persons of genius and talent and supported by private funds from audiences, generous individuals, corporations and foundations. The Federal government cannot and should not seek to substitute public money for these essential sources of continuing support.

However, there is a growing need for Federal stimulus and assistance—growing because of the acute financial crisis in which many of our privately-supported cultural institutions now find themselves, and growing also because of the expanding opportunity that derives from higher educational levels, increased leisure and greater awareness of the cultural life. We are able now to use the nation's cultural resources in new ways—ways that can enrich the lives of more people in more communities than has ever before been possible.

Need and opportunity combine, therefore, to present the Federal government with an obligation to help broaden the base of our cultural legacy—not to make it fit some common denominator of official sanction, but rather to make its diversity and insight more readily accessible to millions of people everywhere.

Therefore, I ask the Congress to extend the legislation creating the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities beyond its termination date of June 30, 1970, for an additional three years.

Further, I propose that the Congress approve \$40,000,000 in new funds for the National Foundation in fiscal 1971 to be available from public and private sources. This will virtually double the current year's level.

Through the National Foundation's two agencies—the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities—the increased appropriation would make possible a variety of activities:

We would be able to bring more productions in music, theatre, literature readings and dance to millions of citizens eager to have the opportunity for such experiences.

We would be able to bring many more young writers and poets into our school system, to help teachers motivate youngsters to master the mechanics of self-expression.

We would be able to provide some measure of support to hard-pressed cultural institutions, such as museums and symphony orchestras, to meet the demands of new and expanding audiences.

We would begin to redress the imbalance between the sciences and the humanities in colleges and universities, to provide more opportunity for students to become discerning as well as knowledgeable.

We would be able to broaden and deepen humanistic research into the basic causes of the divisions between races and generations, learning ways to improve communication within American society and bringing the lessons of our history to bear on the problems of our future.

In the past five years, as museums increasingly have transformed themselves from warehouses of objects into exciting centers of educational experience, attendance has almost doubled; in these five years, the investment in professional performing arts has risen from 60 million dollars to 207 million dollars and attendance has tripled. State Arts agencies are now active in 55 States and territories; the total of State appropriations made to these agencies has grown from \$3.6 million in 1967 to \$7.6 million this year. These State agencies, which share in Federal-State partnership grants, represent one of the best means for the National Endowment to protect our cultural diversity and to encourage local participation in the arts.

In this way, Federal funds are used properly to generate other funds from State, local and private sources. In the past history of the Arts Endowment, every dollar of Federal money has generated three dollars from other sources.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

At a time of severe budget stringency, a doubling of the appropriation for the arts and humanities might seem extravagant. However, I believe that the need for a new impetus to the understanding and expression of the American idea has a compelling claim on our resources. The dollar amounts involved are comparatively small. The Federal role would remain supportive, rather than primary. And two considerations mark this as a time for such action:

Studies in the humanities will expand the range of our current knowledge about the social conditions underlying the most difficult and far-reaching of the nation's domestic problems. We need these tools of insight and understanding to target our larger resources more effectively on the solution of the larger problems.

The arts have attained a prominence in our life as a nation and in our consciousness as individuals, that renders their health and growth vital to our national well-being. America has moved to the forefront as a place of creative expression. The excellence of the American product in the arts has won worldwide recognition. The arts have the rare capacity to help heal divisions among our own people and to vault some of the barriers that divide the world.

Our scholars in the humanities help us explore our society, revealing insights in our history and in other disciplines that will be of positive long-range benefit.

Our creative and performing artists give free and full expression to the American spirit as they illuminate, criticize and celebrate our civilization. Like our teachers, they are an invaluable national resource.

Too many Americans have been too long denied the inspiration and the uplift of our cultural heritage. Now is the time to enrich the life and the mind and to evoke the splendid qualities of the American spirit.

Therefore, I urge the Congress to extend the authorization and increase substantially the funds available to the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. Few investments we could make would give us so great a return in terms of human understanding, human satisfaction and the intangible but essential qualities of grace, beauty and spiritual fulfillment.

RICHARD NIXON.

CHARITY NEWSIES

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, for over 20 years, I have been a member of a charitable organization in my community made up of businessmen that were formerly newspaper carriers in their youth. This is known as the "Charity Newsies."

The second Saturday in December of each year is set aside for the Charity Newsies to conduct their annual paper sale, and the approximately 200 Newsies are on the street corners of the Greater Columbus, Ohio, area from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.

The 1969 sale has been scheduled months ago for Saturday, December 13. In order to keep faith with the needy children of my community, I intend to be on my corner tomorrow.

Incidentally, the proceeds of the sales are used 100 percent for the needy children. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, if debate is not concluded on the current OEO legislation at a reasonable time this Friday, I will by necessity be required to miss the vote in the interest of providing funds for this very worthwhile and long-standing local charity. My current intention, subject to persuasion in the debates, would be to support the substitute under the presidential concept of new federalism, as set forth in the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) yesterday and the substitute bill which is set forth on page 38547 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 11.

THE HYPOCRISY OF DISSENT

(Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "The Hypocrisy of Dissent" which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune of December 1, 1969:

THE HYPOCRISY OF DISSENT

If a few soldiers in Vietnam don black armbands on Moratorium Day, that's dissent, American-style. If students, spurred on by professional agitators, picket the Pentagon and shriek epithets at police, that's just constitutionally-protected dissent.

Comes now Major James Rowe, a Special Forces officer who escaped after five years as a prisoner of the Viet Cong. He has been telling members of Congress that the spirit of American prisoners of war was adversely affected when their Red captors began quoting anti-war statements by U.S. senators and by various publications in the United States.

You might say he's dissenting with the dissenters. But it's not so, according to Sen. Stephen Young, D-Ohio.

It's all a plot by public relations men in the Pentagon, he tells us. And he declares, "Major Rowe should be silenced or assigned to some other post of duty outside Washington. A tour in the Aleutian Islands or some post in remote Turkey might cause his mouthings to be silenced."

The logic becomes clear. If you speak out against the war, you're a patriot looking out for America's best interests. If you speak for the other side, you're in trouble.

The Senator Youngs can't have it both ways. Dissent is dissent and you don't have to get prior approval of opinions.

To smear those who hold opposing views is an old tactic. But there's real danger implicit in Sen. Young's inexcusable attack.

On the assumption that Major Rowe is a professional, career soldier in whom the United States has a sizable investment in training and experience, there's a real chance that his career could be ruined. If generals and admirals can get in trouble with Congress, a major is even more vulnerable.

This cannot be permitted to happen. If someone is to be sent to "remote Turkey" to silence "mouthings," we could come up with a rather lengthy list of other people.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there are 126,445,110 church members in the United States comprising 63.2 percent of our population. Our 321,076 churches are staffed by 360,092 clergymen.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER KANSAS CONGRESSMAN BY WINT SMITH

(Mr. SHRIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, a beautiful and eloquent tribute has been penned by a distinguished former Kansas Congressman, Wint Smith, of Mankato, honoring the memory of the late Edward H. Rees, a Member of the House of Representatives from Kansas who died on October 25, 1969.

Wint Smith, who served the people of Kansas in this House from 1946 to 1961, was privileged to work with Ed Rees and to know him both as a friend and colleague. Like Ed Rees, Wint Smith was one of Kansas' finest Members of Congress and is a Christian gentleman.

Ed Rees was my predecessor in Congress. He represented the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas with honor and distinction for 24 years. He retired from the House in 1960 to return to his native home in Emporia.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the moving eulogy written by Wint Smith following the funeral of Ed Rees in Emporia on October 27, 1969:

A TRIBUTE

Emporia, Kansas, has long been known as one of the "show places" of Kansas, from early pioneer days to the present. It is a city of colleges, beautiful tree-lined streets, and has borne a general air of respectability in all of life's aspects and endeavors. For a period of 40 years, William Allen White put Emporia, Kansas, on the map with his short, terse prose on the issues of the day.

Then Emporia furnished another nationally known man by the name of Edward H. Rees, whose name was a household word when thinking of post offices and Government Civil Service, because for over 20 years he served as leading member of the Post Office and Civil Service committees in the U.S. House of Representatives.

For several weeks prior to October 27th the weather had been dismal, dreary and rainy. But on October 27th, 1969, the day was ideal, bright, sunny and warm. As one drove around the residential area with its shady streets, one noted that the street trees as well as trees along the Cottonwood and Neosho River Valleys were beginning to show their bright, varied colors of the autumn season. Just nature's preparation for the dark, drab winter season that was sure to follow.

One also observed that the Stars and Stripes were being flown in front of and on the porches of several well kept homes. The occasion, of course, was in honor of Teddy Roosevelt's birthday.

Toward 2 o'clock, one saw many people from all walks of life slowly entering a church. Many of these people had lost their youthful step. But their faces showed very plainly that these elderly people were performing a duty they owed to the memory of someone they deeply respected.

Many, many years ago—many people

came from the distant, far-off, hilly, brush-clad hills of Wales—the home of the sturdy Welsh men. These settlers of hardy strength and resolute moral fiber settled as early pioneers in these valley and hills along the Neosha and Cottonwood. Today many of the descendants of these early pioneers, along with ex-governors, ex-congressmen, ex-supreme court justices and many present day state of Kansas officials came to the church in Emporia, Kansas, on this 27th day of October to pay tribute and their last respects to Edward H. Rees, who, in over 40 years of Public Service, achieved a reputation for honest, hard and efficient work for the ideals of his Welsh ancestors and his Kansas kinfolk.

If there ever lived a man who typified and qualified for the teaching of this age old quotation, it was Ed Rees.

"The vision you glorify in your mind, the ideals you enshrine in your heart, this you will build your life by, that you will become."

Someone has said that a good public office holder should have five qualities—ability, clean hands, patience, impartiality and ability to work. Ed Rees had all of these—and one more—loyalty to the belief that honest work is the foundation of all organized society.

Ed Rees gained fame in his own County, in his own State and in the Congress of the U.S. for 24 years as an office holder. He was always humble with grace and quiet dignity; he full well knew to be humble was just a duty; and to be courteous to his inferiors was dignity. Many preach humility, but Ed Rees practiced it throughout his life. True humility, he full well knew, was not an abject grovling, self-depriving spirit, but simply the right estimate of ourselves as God sees us. Humility to Ed Rees was proof of Christian character—the root—mother, nurse, foundation, and bond of all true virtue.

Throughout his life he never sought the grandeur or the handclapping praise so often associated with high public office.

Few people knew that Ed Rees was a close, personal friend of President Herbert Hoover and often spent hours with him—after his term of the Presidency had expired.

I am sure at the end of his earthly journey, he simply wanted his friends, acquaintances and supporters to say, "Your work has been quietly well done. You are a distinct honor to your forebearers in Wales, to your ancestral settlers in Kansas, and above all else, to your own immediate family."

To the oncoming descendants of Ed Rees, his picture on the wall or table will only tell some physical details, but inwardly each should know that Edward H. Rees, to the men of his own time, was a saintly, humble, capable man, who grappled with his day's problems with a humble spirit and a Mona Lisa smile.

And as hundreds of cane-bearing oldsters and friends came to pay their last respects as the casket was laid beneath the golden-leaved maples, the colorful oaks and the ever protective elms from summer's heat and winter's snows, all present knew that the virtues and kindly endeavors of Edward H. Rees would long be praised and remembered in the Valleys of the Cottonwood and Neosha—also to hundreds of his acquaintances, both high and low, throughout Kansas and even to the distant halls of the Congress in Washington, D.C., because Edward H. Rees kept his poise and good sense while lawless powers and brainless mops stormed at the citadels of the virtues he cherished, respected and obeyed. Congressman Rees had inserted in the Congressional Record these lines, "When a Celtic missionary in Wales was asked by the Druid King, 'what would he gain by being a Christian', the reply was not he should be happier or richer or more contented, but rather 'when you become a Christian man you will behold wonder upon wonder and every wonder true'."

We honor the name of Edward H. Rees, one

of Kansas' finest members of Congress, and above all else a Christian gentleman.

Long live his memory.

TOY SAFETY

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from the National Commission on Product Safety a letter endorsing the purposes of House Joint Resolution 1010, one of a number of identical resolutions introduced in the House about 2 weeks ago, and designed to make the Toy Safety Act effective immediately.

When the Toy Safety Act originally passed the House, there was a general feeling that it would be a wonderful step forward to clean unsafe toys off the shelves before the big toy season at Christmas. It would be a splendid thing to be able to go through one Christmas season feeling that there might be a few less stories about children being electrocuted or burned or poisoned or accidentally stabbed to death with the Christmas toys we buy and put under the trees as expressions of our love for our children.

But, Mr. Speaker, the calendar moved inexorably on, and by the time this bill became law, the effective date fell after the Christmas season.

I do not believe it is too late to act. I think if the joint resolution to which I refer is considered at once by the parent committee, it should be brought to the House floor and passed on the Consent Calendar. It would not be as effective as we had hoped much earlier when we passed the bill, but it would save a few lives. One life saved would be worth the cost.

The National Commission on Product Safety, created by act of Congress, agrees with this intention. I am today sending a copy of the Commission's letter to the members of the Commerce Committee, with the hope that they will act on House Joint Resolution 1010 or one of its companion resolutions.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY,

Washington, D.C., December 11, 1969.

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: I am in receipt of your letter of December 8, 1969, requesting our comments on the availability of unsafe toys this Christmas season.

The Commission has found that many toys which were referred to as unsafe at our hearings, toys with similar characteristics, and toys which were referred to in an interim report recommending enactment of the Toy Safety Act are still available in stores this Christmas season. Unfortunately, because of staff limitations, we were unable to conduct a detailed investigation.

You included with your letter a copy of H.J. Res. 1010 which would give immediate effect to the provisions of the Toy Safety Act. Since the Commission favors the greatest possible protection for consumers from unsafe household products, we endorse the purposes of the Joint Resolution.

Yours very truly,

ARNOLD B. ELKIND,
Chairman.

THE LEE FAMILY

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the unusual situation of four generations of a family living together in one household in Newtown, Conn., a town in my congressional district, has recently been publicized in the daily press. The story of this heartwarming establishment in the family of Mr. and Mrs. Harry G. Lee appeared in the New York Times on November 27. With the current tendency toward the breakup of family units the existence of this group is particularly noteworthy and their unique arrangement is worthy of being passed on to a wider audience. It follows:

WHERE FOUR GENERATIONS OF A FAMILY BRIDGE THE GAP TOGETHER

(By Lisa Hammel)

NEWTOWN, CONN.—Nestled under a wooded hill in the outer reaches of Fairfield County is a simple brick and shingle house. Inside the house is an interesting atavism: four generations of a family living together in comparative amity.

"Elasticity—from both ends. I guess that's the answer to the whole thing," said Mrs. Harry G. Lee.

Living in the house with Mr. and Mrs. Lee are their daughter, 16-year-old Cynthia, whom everyone calls Cindy, and Mrs. Lee's mother, Mrs. Edna Swinden, who is 75, and grandmother, Mrs. Hattie Myers, who will be 93 next month.

The Lee's 20-year-old son, Gregory, is away working and auditing courses at a community college in Middletown, N.Y.

This old-fashioned hierarchical family had not always been this way. As a matter of fact, they got together under the same roof only a year ago, after several households had been broken up because of deaths in the family.

COMFORTABLE HOMES

"My mother and grandmother," said Mrs. Lee, who is 40 and teaches grade school in Newtown, "have always been homemakers, with warm, comfortable homes. It would have been a strange thing for them to go into some kind of public facility. And we are just not the kind of people who can turn our backs and say, 'Let someone else do it,' or let them go into an old age home."

"But I don't think it can be done comfortably in a little tiny house," she continued. "There is a time when everyone needs to be alone. I think generations can get together when you have enough room. Of course, it gets rough at times. But it's bound to when you have all these different personalities living together."

While the Lee's shiny new "raised ranch" ("It's really just a plain two-story house," Mr. Lee said) is not huge, it is divided well for the members of the family.

SPECIFIC DUTIES

Everyone in the household has specific duties. Mr. Lee's is mostly to earn a living, which he does weekdays as an executive at a commercial printing plant in Stamford and on weekends doing free-lance advertising.

"Cindy and I take care of the upstairs completely," Mrs. Lee said, "while mother takes care of the downstairs and I do heavy cleaning there periodically."

"I put the wash in the washing machine every morning; mother takes it out and puts it in the dryer and does all the ironing. Cindy and I do all the shopping. Mother generally starts dinner, but I plan it."

"And I bake cookies," Mrs. Swinden added. "Loads of 'em. Truckloads of 'em."

Mrs. Myers makes her own bed every morning and takes care of her own personal needs.

She is also, along with her 75-year-old daughter, the family's official crocheter. The two women estimate they have crocheted several dozen afghans in the last few years and Mrs. Swinden complains that she is now running out of people to give them away to.

EXQUISITE LACE

"But grandmother can't do the really fine work any more," Mrs. Lee said. "Like this tablecloth she made two years ago." Mrs. Lee pointed down to the exquisitely worked white cotton lace cloth that covered the large dining room table.

While the arrangement works well now, Mrs. Lee doubts it would have 10 or 15 years ago.

She explained that she was so concerned about the needs of her husband and her two small children then that she could not have paid as much attention to the needs of other relatives in the house.

She added that she would probably also have worried about "having the children's affections weaned away" by doting grandparents or great-aunts who had more time to indulge the children, or would have been concerned that the children were being spoiled by them.

The Lees maintain that even if the four generations had all started out together under the same roof, it would not have been the same as 100 years or so ago, when "each person had a place in the household and everybody had to do their part in order to survive."

Technology, mobility, increasing affluence and an emphasis on individuality, they pointed out, have made crucial inroads on the viability of the multigeneration family.

With the generations isolated from one another, Mr. Lee said, the older people "sit around all day watching to see who's in the next hearse," while the youngsters think "there's no existence except today's."

He believes that the sense of history and continuity that is provided by having under one's roof "a woman who was born not too long after Lincoln was shot" is an enlarging thing for young people.

And Mrs. Lee sees a reassurance and strengthening both for herself and her grandchildren in learning from grandmother or great-grandmother that "things keep happening in cycles and that 'the world isn't going to blow up' because something has gone awry. As for Cindy, she feels sorry for people who 'only have their parents.' Grandmothers and great-grandmothers, she indicated, have wonderful ways with stories and in providing comfort when that is necessary.

"But nothing against you guys," she said, flipping back her long blond hair and smiling at her parents.

THE TRUTH AT LAST ON VOTING RIGHTS—THE RADICAL LEFT TIPS ITS HAT

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate yesterday on the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I had occasion to comment that the measure was nothing more or less than a political retribution, designed to destroy the sovereignty of the southern people and return them to the infamous "conquered province" status of the radical Republicans of a century ago during the Reconstruction.

A revealing letter to the editor of the local Washington Post, published this morning, speaks with remarkable candor

of the political expediency and utterly shameless demagoguery involved in the initial enactment of the measure and in the desperate attempts to keep it operative and unaltered this year.

The simple truth is that the radical left of the North manipulated the national concern of the decent people of the entire Nation over the assassination of their President, into a despotic and totalitarian power play. Calculations were made of the number of puppet voters necessary to capture the governments and the electoral votes of the Southern States, and emergency measures were undertaken to procure the prompt registration of the required number of robots. To a very small extent this power play bore fruit for there are in public office today several individuals who would not have been elected by an "unpolluted" electorate.

But the conspiracy did not totally succeed, as is evidenced by the presidential election of 1968. On the contrary, people throughout the country have awakened to the truth, and have reacted in typical American fashion, at polls, by removing from public office some of the loudest exponents of this chicanery.

So now the radical left is in trouble. And this is the desperate cry of the conspirators—that above all, the power base which they have attempted to build on the bones of a destroyed freedom in the unyielding South must be finished, because the people of the North, seeing their true purposes, are about to throw the rest of them out of office.

Without federally financed radical puppeteers to pull the strings, the nonwhite vote in the South will be about what it was last month here in Washington, D.C.—about 2 percent of the potential. See my remarks, page 38511 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 11.

I include the letter to the editor as part of my remarks as best evidence of the overall plan.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 12, 1969]

VOTING RIGHTS PROBLEM

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Magna Charta of Negro enfranchisement in the South, is due to expire in a few months. The justice and need of its extension, from the point of view of the Southern Negro, are obvious enough.

In a time, however, when interest tends to center on the Northern urban ghettos, it ought to be pointed out with all possible vigor that the extension of this act is of the most vital concern, not only to Southern Negroes, but to Northern people as well. The chain of reasons leading to this conclusion is both short and unbreakable.

The so-called Southern Strategy for the election of the President is a white Southern Strategy. The great mass of Southern Negro votes will be votes telling against the success of this Southern Strategy. Since it is sure that at least some attempt would be made to re-disenfranchise many Southern Negroes if the act should expire, and that some of such attempted re-disenfranchisement would succeed, it is as safe as anything can be to predict that the expiration of the act will make success of the Southern Strategy more likely, and that it will, therefore, make more likely the election of the Presidents of the sort at whose election the Southern Strategy aims. All this is absolutely certain.

It is equally certain that the election of Presidents of that sort is one of the worst

possible things that could happen to Northern black people.

To sum up, it is quite clear that Northern blacks and their friends should be just as interested as Southern blacks and their friends in the extension of this act. In the past, Southern Negroes have needed the votes of Northern Negroes and Northern anti-racists. By a paradoxical but quite predictable shift, Northern Negroes and Northern anti-racists now need the votes of Southern Negroes, in order to prevent the success of a presidential election strategy, the success of which will be highly deleterious in the North.

To this, of course, it may be added that re-disenfranchisement of Negroes in the South would result in a deterioration of the quality of congressmen and senators coming from the South, with the expectable effect on racial affairs in the North.

It is the plain consequence of all the foregoing that extension of this act is a national problem, prime and immediate, and that all people who are interested in the destruction of racism, North as well as South, ought forcefully to oppose the allowing of this act to expire.

CHARLES L. BLACK, JR.,

Luce Professor of Jurisprudence, Yale University.

NEW HAVEN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and Saturday, December 13, on account of official business.

Mr. HALL, for 12 days, on account of official business in Seventh Congressional District of Missouri.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LUKENS, for 1 hour, December 17.

Mr. CONTE, for 60 minutes, December 16.

Mr. MACGREGOR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) to address the House and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CORMAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. LEGGETT, for 60 minutes, on December 17.

Mr. MCCARTHY, for 60 minutes, on December 17.

Mr. ECKHARDT, for 60 minutes, on December 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADAIR.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZION.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGL in three instances.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. MCKNEALLY.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. DADDARIO in five instances.

Mr. KYROS in five instances.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in two instances.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri.

Mr. WRIGHT in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN in four instances.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. MAHON.

Mrs. CHISHOLM in two instances.

Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. BIAGGI.

Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. DORN in two instances.

Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2102. An act for the relief of Percy Ispas Avram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 1389. An act for the relief of Alex G. W. Miller, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2809. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health, project grants for graduate training in public health and traineeships for professional public health personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the forty-fourth biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies

of the 1969 report of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education (Senate Report 91-501).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2208. An act for the relief of James Hideaki Buck;

H.R. 4560. An act for the relief of Sa Cha Bae;

H.R. 5133. An act for the relief of Pagona Anomerianaki;

H.R. 6600. An act for the relief of Panagiotis, Georgia, and Constantina Malliaras;

H.R. 7491. An act to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes;

H.R. 9163. An act to authorize the disposal of certain real property in the Chickamauga and Chattahoochee National Military Park, Ga., under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949;

H.R. 10156. An act for the relief of Lidia Mendola;

H.R. 11503. An act for the relief of Wylo Pleasant, doing business as Pleasant Western Lumber Co. (now known as Pleasant's Logging and Milling, Inc.);

H.R. 12964. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13763. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2208. An act for the relief of James Hideaki Buck;

H.R. 2238. An act to provide for the relief of certain civilian employees paid by the Air Force at Tachikawa Air Base, Japan;

H.R. 4560. An act for the relief of Sa Cha Bae;

H.R. 5133. An act for the relief of Pagona Anomerianaki;

H.R. 6600. An act for the relief of Panagiotis, Georgia, and Constantina Malliaras;

H.R. 7491. An act to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes;

H.R. 9163. An act to authorize the disposal of certain real property in the Chickamauga and Chattahoochee National Military Park, Ga., under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949;

H.R. 10156. An act for the relief of Lidia Mendola;

H.R. 11503. An act for the relief of Wylo Pleasant, doing business as Pleasant Western Lumber Co. (now known as Pleasant's Logging and Milling, Inc.);

H.R. 12964. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13763. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 15, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of Dec. 11, 1969]

1407. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on questionable pricing of contract negotiated for urgently needed bomb bodies, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1408. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract providing for the rental of saddle and pack animals, and related facilities and services for the public within Zion, Bryce Canyon, and Grand Canyon (North Rim) National Parks, Utah and Ariz., for a 10-year period beginning January 1, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of 67 Stat. 271, as amended (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

[Submitted Dec. 12, 1969]

1409. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 89th quarterly report on export control, covering the third quarter, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1410. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements suggested in accounting methods used in establishing fees for reimbursable testing and related services, Food and Drug Administration, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1411. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract under which the Cavern Supply Co., Inc., will provide facilities and services for the public within Carlsbad Caverns National Park, N. Mex., from January 1, 1970, through December 31, 1989, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271 and 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1412. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of regional maps entitled "Principal Electric Facilities, 1968"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations, U.S. AID Operation in Indonesia (Rept. No. 91-749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works, H.R. 14464. A bill to amend the act of August 12, 1968, to insure that certain facilities constructed under authority of Federal law are designed and constructed to be accessible to the physically handicapped; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 9476. A bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income

of the national service life insurance fund; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 12795. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amount authorized to be expended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 15223. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEN:

H.R. 15224. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, in order to improve the judicial machinery of military courts-martial by removing defense counsel and jury selection from the control of a military commander who convenes a court-martial and by creating an independent trial command for the purpose of preventing command influence or the appearance of command influence from adversely affecting the fairness of military judicial proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 15225. A bill to provide for a coordinated national boating safety program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 15226. A bill to encourage the development of novel varieties of sexually reproduced plants and making them available to the public, by making protection available to those who breed, develop, or discover them, thereby promoting progress in the useful art of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 15227. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to alleviate freight car shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 15228. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 15229. A bill to assist consumers in evaluating products by promoting development of adequate and reliable methods for testing characteristics of consumer products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. St GERMAIN, and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.R. 15230. A bill to amend section 105 of the Clean Air Act to authorize increased grants to be made to certain air pollution control agencies not now eligible therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 15231. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15232. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the payment of

special pay to certain officers of the Medical Service Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 15233. A bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to establish, with the Department of the Interior, a comprehensive and long-range national program of research, development, technical services, exploration and utilization with respect to our marine and atmospheric environment; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 15234. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to prevent dislocation of normal distribution of scarce and critical materials; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15235. A bill to authorize the sale of metal purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury for coinage under the Coinage Act of 1965; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 15236. A bill to create a national commission to study quality controls and manufacturing procedures of medical devices, surgical instruments, artificial organs and limbs, therapeutic instruments and devices, and other medical and hospital equipment; to determine the need for and the extent of Federal regulation of such medical devices; to determine the need for clarification of the definition of medical devices in Federal laws; and to recommend to the President and to the Congress methods for determining constructive minimum performance standards and feasible methods for Federal regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 15237. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, to authorize restrictions and prohibitions on the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides which pollute the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 15238. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 15239. A bill to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (by request):

H.R. 15240. A bill to require the posting of performance and payment bonds by persons contracting with the United States for the dismantling, demolition, or removal of any public building, public work, or abandoned vessel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 15241. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 15242. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 15243. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 15244. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 15245. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 15246. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 15247. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 15248. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 15249. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 15250. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 15251. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 15252. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 15253. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15254. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 15255. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 15256. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 15257. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 15258. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15259. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.J. Res. 1032. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Con. Res. 468. Concurrent resolution expressing the approval of the Congress for the loan of 10,000 tons of nickel held under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Con. Res. 469. Concurrent resolution expressing the approval of the Congress for the disposal of 10,000 tons of nickel in accordance with section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 470. Concurrent resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. Con. Res. 471. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam complying with the requirements of the Geneva Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H. Res. 751. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. HAMILTON introduced a bill (H.R. 15260) for the relief of Dr. Ester T. Hizon, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

355. The SPEAKER presented a petition of George B. Maus, Binghamton, N.Y., et al., relative to pensions for veterans of World War I, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join in the introduction of President Nixon's legislation to extend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities for 3 years and to make certain technical changes.

I share President Nixon's conviction that—

The attention and support we give the arts and the humanities . . . represent a vital part of our commitments to enhancing the quality of life for all Americans.

In my view, the President's request for \$35 million in public funds and \$5 million in matching money for the arts and humanities in fiscal year 1971 is a most significant development. By doubling the amount we are spending on the arts this year, we are, at long last, giving meaningful recognition at the highest levels of government to the important role of the arts in determining the quality of our life.

President Nixon made a number of cogent observations about the role of the arts and humanities in America in the message that he sent to the Congress yesterday. He said:

The full richness of this nation's cultural life need not be the province of relatively few citizens centered in a few cities; on the contrary, the trend toward a wider appreciation of the arts and a greater interest in the humanities should be strongly encouraged, and the diverse culture of every region and community should be explored.

Indeed, participation in cultural activities by as many Americans as possible at the local level is the ultimate aim of the arts and humanities legislation. The President's commitment and the greater funding should make it increasingly possible for State and local arts groups to have the support they deserve and to become economically viable.

Over the past several years, State arts councils have become much more active, principally as a result of the Federal program. For each Federal dollar, States have come up with \$3 from local, State, and private contributions for arts programs.

This, I believe, is what President Nixon meant when he said in his message:

The Federal Government cannot and should not seek to substitute public money for these essential sources of continuing support. . . . The Federal role would remain supportive, rather than primary.

For example, in fiscal year 1968, the National Endowment for the Arts made grants totaling \$8.6 million; but this \$8.6 million generated \$27 million from other sources.

The principal reason for Federal support of the arts, so that all citizens may benefit from the enrichment they offer, is that virtually every major symphony, opera, dance, and ballet company is running at a deficit. Theaters, large and small—on Broadway and in cities around the country—have to face annual cost increases that threaten their continued operation.

President Nixon recognized this crisis in his message:

There is a growing need for Federal stimulus and assistance—growing because of the acute financial crisis in which many of our privately-supported cultural institutions now find themselves, and growing also because of the expanding opportunity that derives from higher educational levels, increased leisure and greater awareness of the cultural life.

What are the dimensions of this crisis? Overall, in the performing arts, there is a deficit of about 30 percent; of perhaps 60 percent in the ballet; and perhaps 40 percent in symphonies. Of our major symphony orchestras, only about 12 have a reasonable hope of remaining alive financially. Similarly, there are only five or six major opera companies in the country today, and about an equal number of significant dance groups. Of all the existing performing arts groups, it is quite clear that only a handful can take their survival for granted.

One of the goals of President Nixon's extension of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and of the increased funds to be available, is "to bring more productions in music, theater, literature readings and dance to millions of citizens eager to have the opportunity for such experiences." I am hopeful that our commitment to preventing financial disaster from overtaking some of these organizations will help reach that goal.

I agree, as well, with the other aims of the President in supporting this vital program:

We would be able to bring many more young writers and poets into our school system, to help teachers motivate youngsters to master the mechanics of self-expression.

We would be able to provide some measure of support to hard-pressed cultural institutions, such as museums and symphony orchestras, to meet the demands of new and expanding audiences.

We would begin to redress the imbalance between the sciences and the humanities in colleges and universities, to provide more opportunity for students to become discerning as well as knowledgeable.

The bill I am introducing today would extend the life of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities for 3 years, through fiscal year 1973, authorizing such sums as may be necessary. It would also make a number of technical changes, including: First, provision for an executive committee in each council in order to facilitate the work of the council between meetings; second, provision for continuity in leadership between expiration of the terms of the two Chairmen and announcement of new appointments; third, authority for the National Foundation on the Humanities to make contracts, as well as award grants; and fourth, adjustments in the per diem of council members to the level given other citizens in similar positions.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs) the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education which has jurisdiction over this legislation, has indicated his intention of holding hearings in late January. I am hopeful that we will be able to act thoughtfully and expeditiously on this important measure.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Danville, Va., Register, the Richmond Times-Dispatch, and the Virginian-Pilot, in the State of Virginia. The editorials follow: [From the Danville (Va.) Register, Sept. 25, 1969]

NEVER UNDERESTIMATE

The Trucking Industry may rue the remark of one of its spokesmen who told a national publication that if the women of the nation want their new hats on time "they'll just have to live with trucks."

And by living with trucks, he meant those 80,000-pound 70-ft. behemoths which the truckers are asking the Congress and some of the state legislatures to make legal.

The Virginia General Assembly at its 1968 session was about to turn down—something rarely done in Virginia—the truck lobby on the highway freight trains it wants legalized. Rather than face defeat, the truckers turned to the authorized study alternative, and this body will recommend authorization of twin-trailers behind a single tractor on multilane highways, which means on the arterial and interstate and throughways or toll roads. That is where they will start. But just as soon as they are accepted on any Virginia roads, the truckers will want to use all roads.

The current drive for highway motor freight trains already has run into the opposition of the General Federation of Women's